The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXVII, No. 3 SEPTEMBER, 1947

CONTENTS

Children's Limbo, Theory or Doctrine?
Joseph LeBlanc, C.J.M. 161

The Necessity of Divine Grace in Conversion
John T. McGinn, C.S.P. 184

Seven-Thirty . . . . . *Leo J. Trese* 194

The Ministry of the Diocesan Priesthood
Joseph Clifford Fenton 196

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Titular Feast and All Soul's Day 216

General Principle Governing Functions *Coram Sanctissimo* 216

Cappa Magna Coram Cardinali vel Metropolitano . . 217

Subdeacon Carrying the Pall after Ablutions . . . 218

Infra Octavam Epiphaniae in 1947 219

Devotion to the Sacred Head 219

Different Reckonings of Time 220

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States, $4.00; Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1947, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

A Pastor's Right to Confirm 221

A Surgical Problem 222

ANALECTA 224

BOOK REVIEWS

Fundamental Rubrics. Principles and Practical Applications, *by John C. O'Leary* 232

Le Saint Esprit en nous d'apres les Peres Grecs, *by Paul Galtier* 232

Introductory Sociology, *by Raymond W. Murray, C.S.C.* . 234

Our Lady of Light, *by Canon Barthas* 235

The Progress of the Jesuits, *by James Brodrick, S.J.* . 236

The New Lectionary, *by Clement H. Crock* . . . 238

Sacrificare. Ceremonies of Low Mass, *by Le Vavasseur, Haegy and Stercky* 238

BOOK NOTES 240

New Dissertations—

Philosophy —

THE THOMISTIC PHILOSOPHY OF THE ANGELS
By James Collins $4.00

THE SOCIAL THOUGHT OF SAINT BONAVENTURE
By Matthew M. De Benedictis, O.F.M. $3.00

THE PHILOSOPHICAL FRONTIERS OF PHYSICS
By Vincent Edward Smith $2.25

Canon Law —

THE MARRIAGE CONTRACT AND THE PROCREATION OF OFFSPRING
By N. Orville Griese $2.00

DISPENSATIONS FROM PRIVATE VOWS
By James Martin Lowry $2.00

RELIGIOUS SUPERIORESSES
By Thomas J. Bowe $2.00

Theology —

MIRACULOUS ABSTINENCE
By Thomas Pater $1.25

A STUDY OF THE METAPHOR OF THE OLIVE TREE IN ROMANS XI
By Myles M. Bourke $1.50

THE RIGHT OF NATIONS TO EXPAND BY CONQUEST
By Raymond De Martini, O.F.M. $2.00

Order through your bookseller or from

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS
WASHINGTON 17, D. C.

CHILDREN'S LIMBO, THEORY OR DOCTRINE?

I. THE THEOLOGICAL VIEWPOINT

Before attempting to solve any problem it is important to place it in its proper atmosphere. Theological problems have a very special and definite atmosphere outside of which they cannot be treated without detriment both to the doctrine and to their exponents. It is precisely the theological atmosphere in which the proposed problem should be viewed, that I wish first to recall in these preliminary notes.

There exists, indeed, between the process to be followed in the investigation of a philosophical problem and the method to be adopted in establishing a definite point of Catholic doctrine, a difference of paramount importance, the ignoring of which is apt to lead to deplorable conclusions.

The philosopher, proceeding from naturally known data and guided by the sole light of reason, may give full vent to his speculations and pre-established conceptions. *His* theories, *his* opinions have the value of the arguments which substantiate them, but no more. He may lend an attentive ear to the wisdom of past centuries, but may, if he so please, simply ignore, discard, and even disdain, his predecessors. The lack of a superior norm in the realm proper to philosophy fully accounts for the appalling multitude of incoherent and contradictory doctrines and hypotheses which have caused the history of philosophy to be principally that of the divagations of the human intellect.

The theologian is confronted with quite a different task. He is faced with a problem relative to the meaning of some portion of the message which God gave to the world through His Son Jesus Christ. It is his business to express the content of this message in such a way that all danger of error and ambiguity be removed; and when called upon to discuss a theological subject he is not considering some *possible* or *hypothetical* kind of knowledge about this message "but one which has been the dominant element in the cultural and intellectual life of the Church of Christ."[1] He has no personal message of his own to deliver to his fellow-men. *His*

[1] Joseph C. Fenton, *The Concept of Sacred Theology* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1941), p. 5.

views, on a given subject are completely out of the question. He knows his vocation to be that of the disciple, repeating the lesson learned at the feet of the Master: "euntes ergo docete omnes gentes . . . . docentes eos servare omnia quaecumque mandavi vobis" *(Matt.* 28:19-20).

Unlike the philosopher, he has an unerring and infallible guide that may lead him safely, even through the most perilous paths; he has indeed "the more firm prophetical word whereunto you do well to attend, as to a light that shineth in a dark place" *(II Pet.* 1:19).

Holy Scripture and Tradition contain the divine message but it is the Church which teaches and defends it. Holy Scripture and Tradition constitute together a definite rule of faith, but one which is only remote and mediate; the living magisterium of the Church constitutes the immediate and proximate rule of faith. As a result, the theologian can hope to find the objective meaning of the revealed word by having recourse to the authentic Interpreter.[2]

To find the exact teaching of the Church will not always be, however, an easy task, for the magisterium of the Church is a complex one. That the Church exercises her teaching magisterium when the Sovereign Pontiffs, utilizing the fullness of their infallible power, or when the Bishops congregated in oecumenical council, declare a point of doctrine to be divinely revealed, no Catholic ignores. But that there is another magisterium, a day-to-day magisterium by which revelation is kept free from error and transmitted integrally to the faithful, many, at least in practice, seem to forget. It is indeed a surprise to many a novice in theology to learn that although there is no "dogmatic definition" on a given subject, it may actually be an article of faith, and that, therefore, one has not full liberty to discuss it.

There can be no question of considering separately the different organs of this ordinary magisterium of the Church. It will be sufficient to mention those which are more accessible to us, some of which are easily overlooked.

Catholic theologians are the qualified exponents of the Catholic doctrine in the schools of the Church. When the entire body of scholastic theologians assert that a thesis is of faith, their testimony is entirely reliable; if all of them should be in error on a point of this importance, then the Church would be deceived. The moral

[2] Cf. *DB.*, 786.

unanimity of the scholastic testimony is in no way impaired if a limited number of writers have called one or the other of their theses in question. The testimony of the theologians is likewise valid even for the propositions that are set forth as theologically certain, and the contradictory to it may be safely qualified as theological error. Even on points of doctrine which are not immediately and directly connected with proposal and defense of the divine message, their testimony cannot be too freely discarded, and the opposition to their teaching may easily take the form of a rash or temerarious proposition.

It is essential for the scholastic theologian that his writings should form part of the traditional and scientific exposition of Catholic Faith, recognized and used as such by the Church. Apart from the special approbation which the Church gives to certain individual scholastics, and which must be considered by itself, the authority of the individual theologian is directly proportionate to the value of the proofs which he adduces in support of his doctrine. If the proof is valid the thesis stands; but should the evidence be not conclusive, the proposition has no legitimate place in the field of sacred theology, on the sole authority of the given writer.

But not only through the teaching of theologians does the expression of the ordinary magisterium of the Church come down to us. This teaching is to be found also in the liturgical prayers and practices of the Universal Church. The authentic liturgical prayers and practices of the Church are an infallible expression of divine Revelation. They pertain indeed to the supernatural order. As a result, the theologian may accept liturgical prayers as an infallible indication of the meaning of the divine message of God to man. When the Church, for example, forbids the burial of unbaptized children in consecrated ground, we may gather from this prohibition an indication that the Church considers these children to be deprived of the beatific vision; that they are not even granted it through that extraordinary "illumination" of Professor Klee.[3]

The *Ecclesia docens* is evidently the primary source to which the theologian must have recourse, but he may also obtain useful information from the *Ecclesia discens,* or from the common belief

[3] Cf. *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review,* August, September, October, 1946.

of the faithful, throughout the world.[4] For this reason theologians, in the course of Christian history, have had recourse to it in favor of the correct interpretation of the Catholic doctrine. St. Augustine was able to point out triumphantly that the doctrine of the Pelagian heretics ran counter to Christian convictions; the history of Arianism affords a similar example. A still more appropriate example is to be found in the condemnation of the Council of Pistoia, by Pius VI, in the Constitution *Auctorem fidei,* where an explicit appeal is made to the belief of the faithful, on the doctrine of the Children's Limbo (cf. *DB,* 1526). This document will be considered more at length farther on.

A mere glance at the theses listed in the manuals of theology will show clearly that not all the propositions defended enjoy the same degree of certitude; and the condemnation of the one hundred and one propositions taken from the writings of Paschasius Quesnel (cf. Constitution *Unigenitus* of Clement XI) is a good evidence of the number and variety of the possible censures that may be attached to an assertion proscribed by the Church.[5]

The theological qualifications, in regard to the certitude they bear, may be reduced to three or four principal categories.

(1) *De fide:* These must be not only divinely revealed truths, but must also be proposed *as such,* in a sufficiently clear manner, either by the ordinary or the extraordinary magisterium of the Church. They are believed solely on the authority of God. Their denial constitutes a heresy.

(2) *Theologically certain:* These are conclusions, which by means of a demonstrative syllogism are drawn from one proposition which is of divine faith and another which is known by reason to be certain. The theologically certain proposition is thereby accepted not on the authority of the revealing God, but precisely because,

[4] "A mother whose child had unfortunately died before baptism could be administered was assured by her parish priest that since the tragic omission had occured without any fault on her part, God would take care of the infant —he was in His hand and she need not worry. The mother like Rachel refused to be comforted and simply replied, 'My child will never see God.' What a wealth of true Catholic instinct and sound theology that short sentence reveals! God would indeed take care of her infant, but she knew instinctively that her infant would never see God." William R. O'Connor, *AER,* XCV, 1, 43.

[5] On this subject cf. Fenton, *op. cit.,* pp. 71-78, 181-98.

by demonstration, this proposition expresses the actual and objective meaning of the divine message. Its certitude is inferior to that of the divine faith proposition, but yet far superior to that attaching to the conclusions of any science obtainable by man. Negation entails an error in faith.

(3) *Sententia communis:* This is a proposition which bears a certain relation to some part of revealed doctrine; but because it is not sufficiently clear that it forms an integral part of Revelation or because it is not propounded as such by its exponents, the certitude which it enjoys is decidedly less than that of the preceding ones. When such statements are put forth and defended by the moral unanimity of theologians, they cannot be rejected without at least a certain taint of rashness or temerity.

(4) *Theological opinions:* These are set forth in such a way that the theologian allows for the possibility of the opposite thesis being true. The theological opinion comes into play when there is either an actual controversy or at least the possibility of such a discussion. It is the first response to the theological problems which may be freely discussed in the Catholic Schools. As time goes on, the great body of theologians recognizes gradually the truth of a certain proposition which had first been taught tentatively in the form of a theological opinion; it may afterwards be defended as certain, and the time may come when the common teaching of the theologians is defined as of faith.

Even though this may not be the ordinary process by which dogmatic definitions have originated, it cannot be denied that theological opinions constitute an important factor in the development of sacred theology, nor is their disappearance from theology to be desired. But to be recognized as such, a theological opinion must be woven into the fabric of theology as a whole and be expounded by serious and approved theologians. Obviously not every individual who puts forth a personal explanation or opinion on a subject of theology is said to produce a theological opinion; only those which form part of a theological system, and that are vigorous enough to survive in a theological School, are really worthy of the name.

There can be no question, of course, in theological opinions, of new doctrines, or propositions which the ancient Church did not admit; still less of statements which have been based on *private* revelation.

With theological opinions the limit of the theological campus has

been reached. To go farther is to lose all contact with the teaching of the Church and, therefore, with theology; it is to be in the open field of theories, hypotheses, and *personal* opinions, to which the Church pays no attention, provided they are not in opposition to her teachings, and which the theologian may readily ignore.

Intent on the gigantic task of keeping free from error and spreading integrally the divine message, the Church cares little to know what *could* or *should* or *would* happen if things were disposed otherwise than they actually are.

When Professor Klee proposes as a mere hypothesis the possibility of God's keeping in store extraordinary means of salvation for the children who are incapable of receiving the baptism of water, no one will dispute him the right to do so; but when we are told by one of his ardent disciples that we have no alternative but to choose between Limbo and the Theory of Illumination, and that *"all data* [italics ours] of Revelation point rather to the Theory of Illumination than to that of Limbo,"[6] we are then urged to go back to our theology and inquire into the truth of such a startling contention.

II. HAS THE CHURCH A TEACHING ON LIMBO?

Holy Scripture, we must admit, contains no definite statement of a *positive* kind regarding the eternal lot of those who die in original sin without being stained with grievous personal guilt. But by insisting on the absolute necessity of being born of water and the Holy Ghost, Christ implies, clearly enough, the necessity of baptism of water for all men to enter into the Kingdom of God. On the other hand, it is evident from Scripture and Catholic Tradition that the means of regeneration provided for this life are not available after death, so that those dying unregenerated are eternally excluded from the supernatural happiness of the beatific vision.

The question then arises as to what, in the absence of a clear and positive revelation, we ought, in conformity with Catholic principles, to believe regarding the fate of such persons, namely, children dying unbaptized. We may, at all events, have recourse to the magisterium of the Church. The question then comes to this: has the Church a teaching on the Children's Limbo?

The fact that the expression "Children's Limbo" *(Limbus puerorum infantium)* is of comparatively recent use in theology should

[6] *HPR,* XLVII, 1, 11.

create no serious difficulty or provoke undue suspicion. New words and expressions have been coined with the development of theology, but the doctrine they describe is as old as revelation itself. Such is the case, among others, with the words "hypostatic union" and "transubstantiation."[7] At any rate *Limbus puerorum* has enjoyed *droit de cité* in theology since the time of the scholastics, and has received authentic recognition—been canonized, as it were—since its introduction into the constitution *Auctorem fidei*"[8] of Pius VI, condemning the Jansenistic Council of Pistoia. This document is of too vital importance, on the subject under consideration, not to be given a brief consideration here:

> The doctrine which rejects *(explodit)* as a Pelagian fable that place of hell *(locum illum inferorum)*—usually called by the faithful "Children's Limbo"— in which the soul of those dying with only original sin are punished by the pain of loss without any pain of fire; and this taken to mean that by denying the pain of fire one thereby necessarily postulates a middle state or place involving neither guilt nor penalty between the Kingdom of God and eternal damnation, such as the Pelagians have invented *(fabulabantur)*:—false, rash, and slanderous to Catholic schools.

We may in all confidence rely upon this document as an authentic and sure guide in the solution of our problem. Omitting for the moment the complete list of informative points that could be gathered from this "constitution," we retain only at present these two: (1) There exists a Children's Limbo, where the souls of children dying with original sin are detained; (2) the doctrine of Limbo, as commonly accepted by the faithful, and taught by the schoolmen, is not a Pelagian fable, but an orthodox teaching.

According to this document there are at least two elements which enter into the notion of Limbo, namely the *pain of loss,* and the *exclusion of the pain of fire.* To these, a third may be safely added: that of natural happiness. So that, in investigating the teaching

[7] Cf. *DB,* 114, 877.

[8] Doctrina, quae velut fabulam Pelagianam explodit locum illum inferorum (quem limbi puerorum nomine fideles passim designant), in quo animae decedentium cum sola originali culpa poena damni citra poenam ignis puniantur; perinde ac si hoc ipso, quod, qui poenam ignis removent, inducerent locum illum et statum medium expertem culpae et poenae inter regnum Dei et damnationem aeternam, qualem fabulabantur Pelagiani:—falsa, temeraria, in scholas catholicas injuriosa *(DB,* 1526).

of the Church on the Children's Limbo, we ought to have a fair idea of the truth, when we have found the answer to the following questions: (1) do these children enjoy the beatific vision? (2) do they suffer pain of sense? (3) do they enjoy natural happiness? (4) where is Limbo situated?

(1) Do Children in Limbo Enjoy the Beatific Vision?

The text of St. John: "Amen, amen, I say to thee, unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God" (3:5), seems in itself sufficiently clear to leave no doubt as to the correct answer; but if doubts remain, they are quickly dispelled by considering the use the Fathers of the Church have made of this particular text, in establishing the absolute necessity of baptism for salvation, not only for adults but for children as well.

Already in the third century, Irenaeus could state that Christ came to save "omnes qui per Eum renascuntur in Deum, infantes et parvulos et pueros."

At least this particular aspect of the problem concerning the fate of unbaptized children was never questioned by patristic writers; and the first to deny the text of St. John and the common teaching was Pelagius.[9] This he did in conformity with his doctrine on the nature of original sin. For him all sin is something personal, proceeding from man's own will and affecting him alone; original sin therefore is out of the question for children, and those dying in infancy must enjoy eternal life. Pelagius readily conceded that no one enters the Kingdom of God without baptism, but not so with Eternal Life. In support of his contention, he quoted *John* 14:2: "In my Father's House there are many mansions." These children share the same happiness in Heaven as adults, with the exception that the latter have a special reward coming to them from their meritorious acts: this is the *Kingdom of Heaven.* Children are saved and enjoy eternal bliss, but in a special compartment of Heaven: this is *eternal life.*

St. Augustine soon made short work of such a new and faulty exegesis. He induced the Council of Carthage,[10] approved by Pope Zosimus, to condemn "the existence of an intermediate place or any other place at all *(ullus alicubi locus)* in which the children who

[9] Cf. St. Augustine, *De pecc. orig.*, 6.

[10] Cf. *DB*, 102 *bis.*

pass out of this life unbaptized enjoy eternal happiness."[11] This is stating in no obscure terms that children dying without baptism are deprived of the beatific vision. The same doctrine was repeatedly asserted afterwards by Popes and Councils; among others, it will be sufficient to mention the decretal of Innocent III stating: "the pain of original sin is the privation of beatific vision, that of actual sin, the torment of hell *(gehennae perpetuae);*"[12] the declaration of the Council of Florence to the effect that baptism of water is the only means for children to be freed from the power of Satan and become the adopted sons of God;[13] the definition of the Council of Trent: "Si quis parvulos recentes ab uteris matrum baptizandos negat, etiamsi fuerint a baptizatis parentibus orti . . . anathema sit."[14]

There is no necessity, it seems, to dwell on a point which has always been taught and accepted as the doctrine of the Church. To say that the thesis which asserts that children dying without baptism are deprived of the beatific vision is one which is at least *theologically certain* is to put it mildly.

But it may be asked: is the exclusion from Heaven for those souls definitive?

Catholic tradition is as unanimous on this point as on the other, and it is for this reason that the doctrine of Dr. Minges is to be rejected as opposed to the traditional teaching of the Church. According to him "forsitan possible sit eos [pureos] salvari si homines justi viatores pro eis merita et pretiosum sanguinem Christi Deo offerunt."[15] All the documents which exclude these children from heaven, exclude them forever.

From the above, we may gather these conclusions:

(a) "Vain and futile are the efforts of some theological writers to find for these children in case of necessity, an equivalent baptism and assure to them a means of salvation" *(DTC,* "Baptême").

Some of these writers seek for the *possible* means of salvation

[11] Concerning the authenticity of this canon cf. Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles,* trad. Leclercq, II, 191, n. 1.

[12] Cf. *DB,* 410.

[13] Cf. *DB,* 712.

[14] Cf. *DB,* 791.

[15] *Compendium theologicae dogmaticae specialis,* II, 141-44.

in the parents, while others look for it in the children themselves.[16] As representative of each group we have Cajetan and Heinrich Klee. Merely as an hypothesis, Cajetan[17] suggested that the prayers of the parents might obtain for these children salvation when baptism is not available. The Council of Trent out of consideration, it seems, for the Cardinal, would not censure the new doctrine; but Pius V was not so considerate and simply ordered the given opinion to be expunged from his writings. Professor Klee[18] expressed as a theory the opinion that these children are given a sudden illumination at the moment of death which enables them to desire the baptism of water when it is impossible for them to receive it, and thus are saved. This hypothesis will be considered more at length hereafter.

(b) These children are *in inferno*. Again the teaching of the Church is clear. "Illorum animas qui in mortali peccato vel in solo originali decedunt, mox in infernum descendere . . ."[19] are the words of the Council of Florence, taken literally from the Profession of Faith proposed to Michael Palaeologus.[20]

Theologically speaking, infants who die without baptism are *in inferno*. It might sound harsh to place them there; nevertheless, that is where they are, and there is no reason why we should refrain from using the term when the Councils use it. It should be remembered, however, that *inferno* is a general term which signifies the state and the place of all those who will never see the face of God, no matter what be their condition.[21]

(2) Do These Children Suffer the Pain of Sense?

There is no evidence to prove that any of the Greek or Latin

[16] *HPR*, XLVI, 11, 854: "Besides the Limbo theory there are many divergent opinions, *all of which fall short of a satisfactory solution*" (italics ours). For detailed analysis and refutation of these various systems, cf. Belamy in *DTC*, "Baptême."

[17] Pallavicini, *Histoire du Concile de Trente* (edit. Migne), IX, 358.

[18] Heinrich Klee (1800-40). "German theologian and exegate. Although Klee was animated by a thoroughly Catholic spirit and by his Katholische Dogmatik helped to promote sounder ideas among the German clergy . . . some of his views, as for instance the origin of the human soul, and on the fate of children who die without baptism, are open to criticism." *Cath. Encycl.*, VIII, 666.

[19] *DB*, 393, 693. [20] Cf. *DB*, 464. [21] Cf. *AER*, XCV, 1, 41.

Fathers before the time of St. Augustine ever taught that original sin in itself involved any more severe penalty after death than exclusion from the Kingdom of God. Explicit references on the subject are rare; but for the Greek Fathers the statement of Gregory of Nazianzus may be taken as representative of the patristic tradition of his time. "It will happen, I believe, that the children dying without baptism will never be admitted by the Just Judge to the glory of Heaven, nor condemned to suffer punishment since, though unsealed [by baptism], they are not wicked. . . . Far from the fact that one does not merit punishment, it does not follow that he is worthy of being honored, any more than it follows that one who is not worthy of a certain honor deserves on account of that to be punished."[22]

If Tertullian opposes the baptism of children it is on the ground that they are innocent.[23] St. Ambrose, explaining original sin to be an inclination to evil rather than guilt in the strict sense, holds that on the day of Judgment those dying with only original sin on their soul will have nothing to fear.[24]

The Pelagian heresy started a problem which, from the time of St. Augustine up to our own day, has been discussed by theological scholars.

In his early writings, St. Augustine agreed with the common teaching of the Greek Fathers. "It is superfluous," he writes, "to inquire about the merit of one who has not any merit. For one needs not hesitate to hold that life may be neutral as between good conduct and sin, and that as between reward and punishment there may be a neutral sentence of the Judge."[25] But in taking the lead in the controversy against the Pelagians, and defending the Catholic doctrine, Augustine went to the other extreme and assigned to these unbaptized children a pain of sense.

Impressed by the evangelical description of the Last Judgment (*Matt.* 25:31 ff.) he saw no alternative but to place these children on the "left." "Nor is there any middle place or state for any man, so that a man can only be with the devil who is not with Christ."[26] "The Lord will come and He will make two groups, one on the right and one on the left. . . . There is no midway place left where

[22] *Orat.* XL, 23.

[23] Cf. *De bapt.*, XVIII.

[24] Cf. *In Ps.* XLVIII, 9.

[25] *De lib. arbit.*, III.

[26] *De pecc. merit.*, 1, 55.

you can place those infants. Therefore he who is not on the right hand without doubt is on the left."[27] "Therefore, he who will not go into the Kingdom, without doubt will go into the eternal fire."[28] "They shall not have life, but the wrath of God abideth in them."[29]

It seems, however, that this doctrine did not go without creating some anxieties for the great Doctor himself, for in *Epist.* CLXVI, 7, he writes: "Cum ad poenas ventum est parvulorum, magnis, mihi crede, coarctor angustiis, nec quid respondeam prorsus invenio." . . . Quae, qualis et quanta erit quamvis definire non possim, non tamen audeo dicere, quod iis, ut nulli essent, quam ut ibi essent, potius expediret."[30] The most he was ever willing to concede was that their punishment is the mildest of all, "mitissima sane omnium poena erit eorum."[31]

It is undoubtedly the influence of St. Augustine which is being felt in the writings of St. Jerome,[32] St. Gregory the Great,[33] St. Isidore,[34] and St. Anselm.[35]

St. Augustine's teaching on original sin enjoyed several centuries of undisputed supremacy. Abelard was the first to challenge it and to rebel against the Augustinian severity condemning the unbaptized children to share the positive sufferings of the damned.[36] Although certain points of Abelard's doctrine were condemned by the Council of Soissons in 1140 *(DB,* 376), his teaching which rejected the material punishment and retained only the pain of loss, as the eternal punishment of original sin, was not only not condemned but was commonly accepted and improved upon by the scholastics.

It was adopted without reserve by Peter Lombard, and through him found its way into scholastic theology.[37]

It acquired a certain degree of authority from the letter of Innocent III to the Archbishop of Arles;[38] which document later found its way into the *Corpus juris,* and is now commonly classified

[27] *Sermo* 14, *De Verbo Apost.,* c. 3.

[28] *De orig. animae,* c. 9.

[29] *De pecc. merit.* 1, 28.

[30] *Contr. Julian.,* 1.

[31] *De pecc. merit,* 1, 1.

[32] Cf. *Dial. adv. Pelag.,* 3, 17.

[33] Cf. *Moral.,* 9, 21.

[34] Cf. *Sent.,* 1, 22.

[35] Cf. *De concept. virg.,* c. 23.

[36] Cf. *Expos. in Ep. ad Rom.,* II, 5.

[37] Cf. *II, Dist.,* XXXIII, 5.

[38] Cf. *Corp. jur. decret.* 1, III, tit. XLII, c. III Majores.

among the authentic ones *(DB,* 410). It is to the effect "that no other pain whether from the material fire or from the worm of conscience, except the pain of being deprived forever of the vision of God," will be suffered by those dying with only original sin on their soul.

The authority of St. Albert the Great[39] and that of St. Thomas was more than sufficient to assure to the new doctrine the place in theology which it has retained up to the present day. Lessius, in expounding this very doctrine, could give himself as the interpreter of his contemporaries and the *continuator* of the scholastics.

The teaching of St. Thomas was received, in the Schools, almost without opposition up to the time of the Reformation; and the very few theologians who stood for the severe Augustinian views were usually designated by the opporbrious appellation of *tortores infantium* (Noris, Berti).

At the time of the Reformation, the Protestants generally, but the Calvinists in particular, revived the Augustinian severity and added to its harshness. The Jansenists could only follow along the same trend. But this new effort to introduce the Augustinian doctrine reacted on Catholic thought in two opposite ways; the result of which was to set up two different parties, one of which either rejected St. Thomas to follow the authority of St. Augustine or vainly tried to conciliate the two; while the other remained faithful to the Greek Fathers and to the Angelic Doctor.

Bellarmine is rightly considered the patron of the first group.[40] He opposed the prevalent scholastic doctrine on the ground that its acceptance would compromise the very principles of the authority of tradition, for he held that St. Augustine, the Council of Carthage, and the African Fathers, intended to teach no private opinion but a doctrine of Catholic faith. Moreover, the Council of Florence had since then clearly expressed itself on the matter: "The souls of those dying in actual mortal sin or in original sin alone go down at once into hell, however with widely different penalties" *(DB,* 693).

Petavius espoused what was fundamentally the same doctrine, but was certainly a little too hasty in giving *his interpretation* of the Council as *de fide.*[41]

[39] Cf. *IV Sent.,* Dist. XLIV-XLV.

[40] Cf. *De amiss. grat.,* 1, VI, c. II, VI.

[41] Cf. *De Deo,* 1, IX, c. 11.

Besides Natalis Alexander[42] and Estius,[43] Bellarmine's chief supporter was Bossuet.[44] He was, however, unsuccessful in his efforts to induce Innocent III to condemn certain propositions of Cardinal Sfrondati, in which the lenient doctrine was affirmed.[45]

But none of these theologians ever succeeded in winning a considerable number of adherents to their side and in turning away the current of Catholic thought from the channel in which St. Thomas had definitively directed it.

Then came the solemn condemnation of the twenty-sixth proposition of the Jansenistic Council of Pistoia. From which it follows that the doctrine on Limbo, such as taught by the Schoolmen and accepted by the faithful, has nothing in common with the Pelagian intermediate state between heaven and damnation, and that infants dying without baptism endure no pain of fire *(DB,* 1526). This document of the extraordinary magisterium of the Church may be considered the death-knell of extreme Augustinianism, while at this time the mitigated form had been rejected by the great bulk of Catholic theologians.

But there is yet another angle of the problem that cannot be overlooked. Granted that children in Limbo do not suffer any pain of sense coming from the exterior—*ab extrinseco*—do they not experience at least an interior affliction, and a most intense one, coming from the loss of beatific vision as their supernatural end?

This aspect of the problem did not escape St. Thomas' attention, and he solved it in his usual masterful way, maintaining always that those children will suffer no interior pain whatsoever coming from the privation of beatific vision. And it is no discredit to the Angelic Doctor to add that his reasoning on the matter underwent a certain change in the course of years. In his early works he granted that these children in Limbo know the existence of heaven and beatific vision, but at the same time understand that it is completely beyond their reach; and no man will reasonably grieve over the loss of what he knows to be undue to him. Their knowledge is a mere natural one while the beatific vision is supernatural. In *De malo,* (q. 5, a. 5), he later gives another solution which is now

[42] Cf. *De pecc. et virt.,* 1, 1, c. 12.

[43] Cf. *Sent.,* II, XXXV, 7.

[44] Cf. *Defense de la Tradition,* 1, IV, c. II.

[45] Cf. De Rubeis, *De pecc. orig.,* LXXIV.

commonly accepted. These children will know that they are created for happiness: one which consists in the attainment of the perfect good they are capable of receiving; but they will not know that this perfect good consists in the beatific vision; and this in conformity with *I Cor.* 2:9-10: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things God has prepared for them that love Him."

As far as their presence at the last judgment is concerned three solutions have been pronounced:[46]

(a) There is no cogent reason, as far as revelation makes us know, to place them there, since that judgment is for the sake of rewarding and punishing personal works of which these children are incapable; not assisting at the last judgment, they will not be aware of the supernatural happiness of the elect, and will therefore experience no regret.

(b) According to others they will be present at the last judgment, understand to a certain extent what it is all about, but being perfectly submitted to the will of God, not only they will not grieve, but will fully acquiesce to the mysterious designs of Providence, and rejoice that by a premature death they have escaped the punishment of the damned.

(c) St. Thomas' followers on this point maintain that even if they are present at the last judgment, a special revelation will be needed to make known to them that the beatific vision is their destined end; and such a revelation is neither called nor required.

(3) Do These Children Enjoy Natural Happiness?

There is no question of asking if these children will attain that natural happiness, properly so called, to which corresponds a complete happiness in the same order, because God has not assigned to his creatures a twofold end, a supernatural one for the adults and a natural one for infants dying unbaptized. These, like all others who do not finally attain the beatific vision, miss the only end for which they have been created and thereby miss eternal salvation. Consequently they are in an abnormal state, and in one which differs *formally* from the one which would have been theirs had man been left in the state of *pure nature,* ordained to a purely natural end.

But the question may arise—and it did—as to whether these

[46] Cf. Suarez, *De pecc. et virt.,* Disp. IX, sect. VI.

children enjoy the same *elements* of happiness which would have been theirs, after death, in the state of pure nature. And the problem thus proposed has received, as can easily be foreseen, two different solutions.

(a) *St. Thomas.* The Angelic Doctor teaches expressly that children dying without baptism enjoy, in their body and soul, a real natural happiness; for all the reasons which exempt them from all pain of sense converge towards the solution of this particular problem. Although they are separated from God by the privation of supernatural gifts, they still remain united with Him by the natural qualities they obtained from Him, and this is sufficient to know God and love Him with natural powers. "Quamvis pueri non baptizati sint separati a Deo, quantum ad illum conjunctionem quae est per gloriam, non tamen ab Eo penitus separati sunt. Imo Ipsi conjunguntur per participationem naturalium donorum; et ita etiam de Ipso gaudere poterunt, naturali cognitione et dilectione."[47] The impassibility of their bodies is explained, not by an extrinsic quality, as for the adults, but because there will be no extrinsic cause of suffering.[48]

Other theologians have been even more explicit than the master. Suarez does not hesitate to affirm that these children love God *perfectly* and above all things. Lessius is of the opinion that they possess a *superior* knowledge, both of the material and the spiritual world.

(b) *Bellarmine.* The sainted cardinal holds that children in Limbo will experience a real grief coming from the privation of the beatific vision and this grief is incompatible with happiness.[49] He is willing to concede that this grief will be a very light one, either because they are conscious of not having lost supernatural happiness through a fault of their own, or because they rejoice that they have escaped the miseries of the damned. Besides, he not only defends his contention with determination, but goes as far as to treat the opinion of his adversaries as heretical. "Fide catholica tenedum est parvulos sine baptismate decedentes esse damnatos, et non solum coelesti sed etiam naturali beatitudine perpetuo carituros."[50] The first part of the proposition is willingly granted, but

[47] *II Sent., Dist.* XXX, q. 2, a. 2, ad 5um.

[48] Cf. *II Sent., Dist.* XXX, q. 2, a. 1, ad 5um.

[49] Cf. *De amiss. grat.*, l. VI, c. VI.

[50] Cf. *De amiss. grat.*, l. VI, c. 2.

for the privation of natural happiness it is altogether another question. Palmieri shows that not only is the assertion of his confrere exaggerated and unjust, but refutes in detail the arguments of the cardinal.[51]

As far as can be ascertained, Fr. Schmidt is the only theologian of modern times who has ventured to defend Bellarmine's position in its integrity; according to him the fate of these children "potius misera quam felix dicenda est."[52] It is apparently the last effort to revive the Augustinian severity on this particular point.

So "it may confidently be said that as the result of centuries of speculation on the subject, we ought to believe that these souls enjoy and will eternally enjoy a state of perfect happiness, and that is what Catholics usually mean when they speak of *Limbus infantium,* the Children's Limbo."[53]

To go further and determine the particular state and condition of these children is to enter into a field in which theology, as such, is not interested. Modern theologians have not resisted the temptation to go beyond. Canon Didiot, for example, is "tout disposé à croire que des relations sont possibles et mêmes fréquentes entre le Ciel des élus et le Limbe des infants; que le lien du sang conservera sa force dans l'éternité et que la famille chrétienne reconstituée là-haut ne sera pas privée de la joie de retrouver et d'aimer ses chers petits associés d'un jour."[54] Fr. Bede Jarrett, O.P. (*House of Gold,* p. 167), musing on the condition of these children prefers to see them going up to pay a visit to their parents rather than the parents coming down to them.

If these and other products of unbridled imagination were taken to be an essential element in the notion of Limbo, then it could easily be regarded as a theory or an hypothesis, but such puerile conceptions have no currency among the faithful and the Schoolmen.

(4) Limbo as a "place."

The documents of the extrordinary magisterium of the Church on the *place* of Limbo are more scarce than those on Limbo as a *state.* The Councils of Florence[55] and Lyons[56] merely affirm that

[51] Cf. *De deo creante,* p. 653.

[52] *Quaest. select.,* p. 278.

[53] *Cath. Encycl.* art. "Limbo," by J. P. Toner.

[54] *Morts sans baptême,* pp. 67 f.

[55] Cf. *DB,* 693.

[56] Cf. *DB,* 464.

the souls of those dying in original sin "descendunt in infernum;" the constitution *"Auctorem fidei"* asserts the *existence* of such a place.[57]

In the perspective of theology Limbo is a part of *infernus:* "hell" in the sense of inferior regions. Antiquity has always distinguished two zones in hell, the inferior, that of the damned; the superior, the sojourn of those who are awaiting the coming of Christ. When the scholastics realized that children dying without baptism form a special group, in a special state, they had to find for them a special place wherein to abide. Albert the Great locates the *Limbus puerorum* below the *Limbus patrum,* but in a region superior to that of the reprobates.[58] Nor did St. Thomas completely overlook the question: "si ergo infernus et purgatorius non sunt idem, videtur quod nec limbus puerorum et patrum sunt idem,"[59] but as to the geography of the Other World he was always most reserved: "Quantum ad situm loci probabiliter creditur idem locus fuisse, nisi quod requies beatorum adhuc erat in superiori loco quam limbus puerorum sicut de limbo et inferno dictum est."[60]

The theologians, as a rule, have imitated the prudence and reserve of St. Thomas in this matter.

Such appear to be, as far as can be gathered, the notion and the doctrine on Limbo which have currency in theology; not all the elements which enter into the notion of Limbo enjoy, as may be seen, the same degree of certitude; but if our sources are reliable we seem to be authorized to conclude that: (1) the existence of a *place* and *state* called Limbo, in which children dying without baptism are detained and where they suffer pain of loss but not of fire, belongs to the teaching of the Church and cannot be denied by Catholics, scholars or not; (2) the doctrine which holds that these children suffer no pain of sense, neither interior nor exterior, but that they enjoy on the contrary natural happiness, remains an opinion, but a *theological* one—that of St. Thomas, and the one commonly accepted by the theologians.

Thus the answer to the problem which goes to make the title of the present article would seem to be sufficiently clear, were we not told that "all data of revelation point" not towards *our* Limbo but in a completely opposite direction.

[57] Cf. *DB,* 1526.

[58] Cf. *Opera,* XXX, col. 503.

[59] *IV Sent., Dist.* XLV, q. 1, a. 2.

[60] *Ibid., loc. cit.*

III. SCRIPTURAL AND THEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF PROFESSOR KLEE'S ILLUMINATION THEORY

The author of the articles published in the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*[61] in support of Heinrich Klee's Illumination Theory certainly deserves credit for having imposed upon himself the task of unearthing all the imaginable and conceivable arguments which can be proferred against the accredited doctrine of Limbo. They cover indeed the entire field of ecclesiastical knowledge, ranging from private to public revelation, Scripture to Tradition, canon law to exegesis, commentators to ascetical writers: *ex omni lingua et natione.*

Unfortunately the author does not make sufficiently clear what he means by a *theological* opinion or hypothesis, and whether he defends Professor Klee's opinion as a mere "possibility," not repugnant in itself, or a real theological opinion. But whatever be his intentions, it is certain that most readers, after reading the three articles, retain the strong impression that, for the author at least, the theory of Professor Klee is the only satisfactory solution to be given to the problem of unbaptized children, and not to be placed on a parallel with that of Limbo, but far exceeding it in probability (or certitude).

If it is in reality a case of mere *possibility,* philosophy alone is able to take care of the problem with its thesis on the *omnipotentia divina.* There seems to be however much more than a mere possibility involved here, for we are seriously warned of the practical consequences that they may be ours if "we deny all hope of salvation to unbaptized children," for it could be that "Christ will rebuke us too;" and it is precisely for this reason that we feel obliged—to be on the safe side—to consider, at least briefly, the reasons which militate against our position.

We are first told that Klee's hypothesis, "besides, has many advantages, and eliminates *very serious difficulties in our theology*" (italics added).[62]

The presence of difficulties in theology—even of serious ones—is by no means embarrassing for the theologian, nor an indication that his thesis is false. Even the philosopher has his difficulties . . . to solve. What would be an article of St. Thomas without its objec-

[61] Cf. *HPR,* XLVI, 11 and 12; XLVII, 1.

[62] *HPR,* XLVII, 1, 11.

tions? They are placed there in evidence, but to be solved. Difficulties and obscurities are for the theologian a rather sound indication that he remains in the field that is properly his, namely the supernatural one; he is mindful always of the admonition of the Apostle: ". . . oportet ad sobrietatem sapere."[63]

There are two principal difficulties adduced against the doctrine of Limbo: the "deplorable state" in which the doctrine places unbaptized infants, and the *divina voluntas salvifica.*

(1) The first difficulty might be phrased thus:

> Under the Old Law children were granted all possible means of salvation: the *sacramentum naturae,* circumcision *(Gen.* 17:10); besides, under the New Law children enjoy a privileged condition: *(I Cor.* 7:14) and especially *Mark* 10:13-16: "Let the little children come to me, and do not hinder them, for of such is the Kingdom of God;"[64]
>
> *But* with Limbo millions perish who were saved under the Old Law. Is this the fullness of time? Is this the good tidings for these privileged children?
>
> *Therefore* admit Klee's Illumination, which obviates the difficulty.

Can one seriously contend that Christ, by making the sacrament of Baptism a necessary means of salvation for all men, and thereby forcing the unbaptized children to go to Limbo, has placed these in a condition far worse than that which would have been theirs under the Old Law in similar circumstances? We doubt it and this is why.

It is altogether gratuitously assumed that there are now millions of children who are deprived—with the existence of Limbo—of the means of salvation who would have been saved under the Old Covenant.

(a) *The "sacramentum naturae."* Concerning the "sacramentum naturae" there is only one thing which is absolutely sure—at least theologically certain—and it is the *existence* of such a remedy for original sin before the Mosaic Law; the *nature,* however, of this particular remedy remains a fertile subject of more or less probable opinions and hypotheses. Here we have two schools of thought. Some contend that a mere *interior* act of faith, or something similar, on the part of the parents was sufficient to apply this remedy; while the others, generally with St. Thomas *(Sum. theol.,* III, q. 70, a. 4), claim that some kind of exterior sign was necessary for this purpose,

[63] *Rom.* 12:3.

[64] Cf. *HPR, art. cit., passim.*

basing their contention on the analogy of this remedy with circumcision and our sacraments.

But the precise manner and the precise moment in which this remedy was applied to the children no one knows exactly. The defender of Klee's theory seems to take it for granted that it was—or that it could be, especially in case of danger—applied to them before they were born. But Gonet furnishes us with a pertinent remark, when he writes, "If the faith of the parents *alone* justified infants under the Law of nature, without any exterior sign, then the remedy could have been applied to them in the womb of their mother; which is inadmissable."[65]

Most probably those children, like those of today, had to be born before being cleansed of original sin; all the more so since for the ancients no one was a "man" before he appeared in this world. So it can be presumed that from Adam up to the time of Moses there were many children who were unable to receive this remedy of original sin and therefore preceded their little brethren of the New Testament into Limbo—millions of them.

(b) *Circumcision (Gen.* 17:10 ff.).[66] Do not read any more according to the Douay or Vulgate edition, but "according to the latest German Catholic standard edition:"[67] *"But one who is healthy,* and nevertheless is not circumcised, whose flesh of the foreskin is not circumcised that (such a man) human being shall be destroyed out of his people, because he hath broken my covenant." So according to the most recent translations, a Jewish boy, eight days old, had to be circumcised only *"if he were physically well."* This we are told is very important.

Here again, can one seriously hope to defend the proposition that children of the New Law, with baptism, are, with reference to salvation, in a condition inferior to that of the Jewish boys under the Mosaic Law? Most likely the Jewish boys also had to see the light before the remedy of original sin could be applied to them: circumcision on the eighth day, or "sacramentum naturae" for the *physically unfit.* Where then are those millions of cases when baptism cannot be administred, when either the "sacramentum naturae"

[65] *Clypeus, de sacr., Disp.* II, a, 1, p. 2, n. 70.

[66] The Vulgate and the Douay versions are literal translations of the Septuagint: *ἀρσενικὸν,* and the Hebrew text (Kittel): *zakar* (masculus).

[67] *HPR,* XLVI, 12, 924.

or circumcision could have been applied? Anyone, even a pagan, may baptize validly; natural water is sufficient; "Quia ratione suae communitatis et abundantiae est conveniens materia necessitatis hujus sacramenti; potest enim ubique et de facili haberi." *(Sum. theol.,* III, q. 66, a. 3).

To many children may now be applied a remedy for original sin which could not be applied under the Old Law, Mosaic or pre-Mosaic, as the baptism of fetuses is now of common occurence. This the Church not only permits, but prescribes; Canon 747 of the Code reads thus: Curandum est omnes fetus abortivi, quovis tempore editi, si certo vivant, baptizentur absolute, si dubie sub conditione. Not only that, but they may be baptized in the mother's womb: Fetus in utero baptizatus, post ortum denuo sub conditione baptizetur (Can. 746).

(2) The *divina voluntas salvifica.*[68] The difficulty may be thus summarized:

God wills all men to be saved *(II Tim.* 2:1 ff.; *Wisdom* 9:24 ff.);
But with Limbo these children are given no chance whatsoever of being saved;
Ergo.

The problem of the *conciliation* of the *divina voluntas salvifica* with human liberty has always been a difficulty to theologians of all times and all schools; as long as there will be a Thomist and a Molinist school in the Church the question will remain a controverted one. But such a controversy must not make us lose sight of the fact that both the *divina voluntas salvifica* and human liberty are articles of faith.

To complicate an already complicated problem by confronting it with another one which has its own difficulties seems poor theological policy. The *conciliation* of the divine salvific will with the existence of Limbo remains a problem for theologians. But in the meantime "these theologians" do not forget that original sin can neither undo nor blot out these dogmatic truths and facts: that God wills all men to be saved, and that Christ assumed the *human nature of the infants too* . . . etc.[69] But in the meantime, just as truly, the proponents of the Illumination Theory should not forget that both the *divina voluntas salvifica* and the existence of Limbo—

[68] *Ibid.,* 926.

[69] *Ibid.,* 11, 854.

such as understood by the faithful and taught by the Schoolmen—cannot be blotted out from the teaching magisterium of the Church, and that therefore one has not full liberty to admit or reject the existence of Limbo.

The theologians defending the doctrine of Limbo may confess, without any inconvenience, their ignorance concerning the *conciliation* of these two Catholic truths; but, not having refused to give tentative solutions to problems just as mysterious, they could hardly remain silent over this one. The solution most commonly accredited among the theologians seems to be that of Card. Franzelin.[70] God, being the absolute Master of His supernatural gifts, has the right to put the conditions He pleases on their distribution; among these conditions He placed the *concursus* of human liberty together with the functioning of natural causes; and for reasons known to Him alone, He has not judged fit to change at all moments the course of nature, by frequent miracles, in order to assure to each individual infant baptism of water. God is not responsible for defects arising from the human element; He does not will, but only permits them. This solution receives an added weight if we consider that the Church to which Christ has committed the means of salvation is a social institution, and that He willed men to be saved by men. Of course, there are other explanations possible, but the given one is certainly as acceptable as any inspired by imagination or sentimentality; preferable in all regards to that given by the Pelagians, or any other opinion akin to it.

The Illumination Theory certainly eliminates a number of serious difficulties attendant on the doctrine of Limbo, but unfortunately it creates still more serious difficulties by eliminating a great deal of theology.

JOSEPH LE BLANC, C.J.M.

Holy Heart Seminary,
Halifax, Nova Scotia

[70] *Tract. de deo uno,* pp. 547-60.

MISSION INTENTION

"More Missionary Vocations in Latin America" is the Mission Intention for the month of September, 1947.

THE NECESSITY OF DIVINE GRACE IN CONVERSION

Fr. Fulton, the Jesuit and an early ally of the non-Catholic apostolate, was asked by a lady how many converts his confreres made on a Boston mission. "None," was his emphatic reply. "I heard that they made over forty," she remarked. "Ah! but it was the Holy Spirit who converted them," tartly observed the priest. He was not pampering a fondness for quibbling or addicted to puerile attempts at edification. He was a missioner speaking the sober truth, one which he found too frequently overlooked.

Making converts plunges us unceremoniously into the realm of the supernatural. Our objective and the primary weapons for its accomplishment lie in the kingdom of grace. Though this aspect of conversion may be unobtrusive and silent, it is always the most necessary and decisive. Consequently, any campaign for converts will require an unremitting crusade for grace, else it is foredoomed to sterility.

THE GIFT OF GOD

The convert-maker soon observes that God is lavish with His graces and that we are not reduced to hand-wringing impotence even in bigoted communities. But mounting evidence quickly convinces him that he is little more than an unwieldy instrument in the hand of God. And he grows ever more chary of the possessive phrase "my converts."

For one thing, unexpected disappointment will caution him against the assumption that any person, however well disposed, will be easily converted. He learns not to count chickens before they're hatched. A devout, intelligent girl once joined a class I conducted because she deplored her minister's neglect of fundamental Christian doctrines. She was regular in attendance, fervent in prayer and read our literature avidly. A nearby Catholic church burned down and she solicited funds for its restoration. Her dispositions seemed transparently favorable, and I took it for granted she was one member of the class whose conversion was least in doubt. Yet for fully two years she remained unconvinced and struggling with her religious difficulties.

Then again, a priest comes to realize by actual observation that it is only with the infusion of grace that "the water of conviction is

changed into the wine of faith." I recall another convert who had been studying the Church and who grew exasperated at the churlish opposition of a friend. He played the role of a Catholic for the occasion and rehearsed the arguments that support our position. It must have been a creditable performance, for his friend apologized and could find no flaw in the demonstration. Yet he himself could not conscientiously join the Church he so ably defended until much later on.

"But it is one thing," explains Chesterton, "to conclude that Catholicism is good and another to conclude that it is right. It is one thing to conclude that it is right and another to conclude that it is always right. I had never believed the tradition that it was diabolical; I had soon come to doubt the idea that it was inhuman, but that would only have left me with the obvious inference that it was human. It is a considerable step from that to the inference that it is divine. When we come to that conviction of divine authority, we come to the more mysterious matter of divine aid. In other words, we come to the unfathomable idea of grace and the gift of faith; and I have not the smallest intention of attempting to fathom it. It is a theological question of the utmost complexity; and it is one thing to feel it as a fact and another to define it as a truth."[1]

Any personal satisfaction we indulge at the reception of converts is tempered by the knowledge of the subsidiary function we perform. To be sure, most of those who complete our instructions are baptized immediately. Many of them navigate with comparative smooth sailing because they have already weathered successfully their worst spiritual storms; though even with them we are not always spared some anxious moments.

But with many others, we recall the apprehensions they caused us, often tempting us to despair of their conversion. We review the curious chain of circumstances that attracted them and the inauspicious tendencies they sometimes displayed. At first, and perhaps for a lengthy period, they were excessively timorous, cautiously reserved or militantly belligerent. Later on, one became less communicative, another revealed more profound difficulties than first acknowledged and a third discontinued instructions for a time. When cordial relations were established, new sources of anguish were disclosed. The opposition of associates agitated the mind,

[1] *The Catholic Church and Conversion*, p. 66.

clouding understanding, and put obstacles in the way of keeping appointments. Satan bestirred himself and induced the catechumen to count the cost of conversion, to weigh the burdens he must assume and the comfortable habits to be discarded. These obvious and common causes of misgiving and a dozen other subtle and elusive remind a priest that his level best efforts of themselves were essentially inadequate to the problem.

The priest remembers, however, the many manifestations of a hidden hand patiently at work giving the inquirer greater understanding, strength of resolution, and silently directing events. Where ripe experience, facility in personal relations and learned books proved altogether unavailing, the Holy Spirit calmed the turbulent waters. A point was reached where the inquirer became a docile pupil, eager only to learn. He may have grown enthusiastic in explaining the faith to his friends and impatient to be baptized. As these experiences multiply, the seasoned campaigner appreciates why Francis Xavier, writing to Ignatius, affirmed that it was the prayers of Europe that made conquests in Asia. And he is content to say with St. Paul: "I have planted, Apollo watered, but God gave the increase."[2]

Converts themselves, as they review the pilgrimage they have just completed, are quick to acknowledge their unreserved dependence on grace. "Again and again," says Ronald Knox, "I have wondered at myself for not slipping back, by sheer spiritual exhaustion into my old ways of thought and my old easy contentment. I suppose it must have been the Poor Clares, whom Father Martindale had asked to pray for me, and those others who were praying for me unasked, that pulled me back every time and kept me face to face with my despairs."

They remember a day when they needed strength to grapple with self and all the powers of evil; the light to see the truth and to distinguish it from the half-truths and plausible errors that subjugate so many fine minds; the courage to take halting steps into an unknown land and not turn back; the humility to bend pride; the resolution to withstand the contempt of friends and the disapproval of loved ones; the sincerity to look into the face of duty and obey; and the faith to say "I believe!" They found no such strength in frail human nature; they discovered it in the keeping of God.

[2] *II Cor.* 3:6.

Many important elements go into the winning of a convert, but all are trivial in comparison with the need of supernatural aid. And since grace was won for us by a Saviour who prayed in a garden and who died on a cross, it is no cause for wonder that this grace will often await the fervent prayer and generous sacrifice of those who would advance the interests of Christ.

THE NEED OF A SPIRITUAL CRUSADE

"First things first" is a principle to which few will take exception. And convert work should be initiated by ardent appeals for grace before we undertake matters of lesser consequence. In order, therefore, to insure from the faithful the volume of petition and penance equal to our need, we must devote considerable attention to their instruction on the subject. To fail in this is even more hazardous than to fumble in our dealings with non-Catholics themselves.

A somewhat long and varied stint on the missions leads me to the reluctant conclusion that the conversion of this nation deserves better of our spiritual generosity. Our people recognize, theoretically at least, that conversion is the product of grace and that prayer and sacrifice are the best means of assuring its bestowal. But their devotional habits do not always manifest a practical grasp of this truth.

The people are quite aware of the need of praying for sinners and for the Poor Souls, and few devout Catholics neglect to do so. But their awareness of the same exigency regarding those entangled in religious error is apt to be less keen. Occasionally we meet a person who does make this specific intention a prominent feature of his exercises of piety. Converts themselves are naturally thoughtful in this regard. Unfortunately, others are tardy to discern this necessity until some painful crisis arises in their own household or intimate circle. A boy finds himself in love with a girl apathetic towards religion, a mother is horrified at her son's gradual drift from the faith, a wife grows alarmed at her non-Catholic husband's increasing prejudice—and these compelling problems drive them to their knees. But if these perilous situations had not arisen, they might have continued to be rather unconcerned regarding those in heresy or unbelief.

There are various straws in the wind that give us some indication of this inadvertance. While some of our special services attract huge

crowds, the Church Unity Octave and the Novena at Pentecost are usually slimly patronized. On the many novenas I conducted throughout the country, there was only one parish where prayers for the conversion of non-Catholics (as indicated on the intention cards) were not regrettably few, until the matter was called to the attention of the people. An old nun in a cloistered convent once remarked to me, after a conference on this topic, that never in her community life had a public prayer been offered for the conversion of America. And religious in other communities made similar admissions. Indeed, many Catholics who do pray for this intention erroneously regard this as merely supplementary to the more important labor of preaching, writing, and instructing.

Some of the main causes for this inadequacy are not far to seek. For one thing, we have been on the religious defensive for a long time and many Catholics have seldom entertained the possibility of large-scale conversions in America. This has not encouraged ambition for spiritual conquest even in our prayers. Then again, the venemous prejudice of bigots and the inexcusable ignorance of otherwise intelligent people regarding the Church may rankle grimly in our minds. This may nourish a subconscious resentment and bitterness that is little conducive to charity or generous prayer. It is quite possible that our native penchant for doing things and our impatience for quick returns may be involved. This sometimes makes for a more spirited concern with the fruits of apostolic zeal than with the hidden roots from which they must grow. In any case, it is necessary to broadcast among the faithful our urgent need for a share in their prayers and sacrifices, otherwise our most strenuous exertions for converts will prove unproductive.

THE APOSTOLATE OF PRAYER

For a number of years, the writer incorporated an instruction on the apostolate of prayer during missions, novenas and retreats. Some of the most gratifying and enduring results of many a mission season are inseparably associated with this experiment. Time and again I learned that it is not difficult to win the spiritual liberality and practical co-operation of the people once they are persuaded of our necessity and knowledge of the doctrine is imparted to them.

A priest has many opportunities to point out that God has made a world in which all His creatures are mutually dependent. He is

the First Cause of all that exists and the ultimate source of all well-being and action. Yet He does not always produce His effects immediately and directly. He is often pleased to work through secondary causes. While He is always the Master Workman, He achieves many results through the co-operation of His creatures. In the creation of a human person, for instance, God acts through the instrumentality of a human father and mother. And that newborn child will be dependent until the end of his life on a veritable army of other agents. The normal development of that person, for all its radical independence, will require priests, physicians, teachers, public servants, friends, writers of books, and a host of others. The very clothes we wear, the homes in which we dwell and the food that comes to our tables are the work of a hundred hands we shall never clasp. No man lives alone, and much of the tragedy of life arises from the thoughtlessness and irresponsibility of those who do not serve their fellows.

Now God has followed much the same plan with regard to man's spiritual welfare. The interdependence of men in spiritual matters is even more marked than in temporal concerns. Of course, Christ is the sole Redeemer, the one Mediator and the source of all true religion. And God does grant to each man the grace necessary to do good and avoid evil; nor does He refuse to bless souls immediately and directly. But Christ has won for us an ocean of supernatural graces and these He willed to grant, in large measure, according to the fervor of the appeal of His followers.

When Catholics fail to pray for their separated brethren, the latter will lack many graces that would have facilitated their journey to the Church. The relative fewness of our converts is not always to be ascribed to bigotry, bad faith, or moral delinquency on the part of non-Catholics. Certainly, these elements are at work and do obstruct the quest of Christ for souls. Nevertheless, it does lie within our power to win heavenly strength and light for the spiritually weak and blind. Consequently, when we remain unaffected by their need and neglect to besiege heaven with our prayers for them, we may limit the action of grace in their lives. Despite our spiritual opulence, we may remain self-centered even in prayer, and men may struggle with error and evil unassisted by the help we could have brought to their efforts. "I desire therefore," says St. Paul, "first of all, that supplications, prayers, intercessions and thanksgivings be made for all men . . . for this is good and acceptable in the sight

of God our Saviour, Who will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth."[3]

THE APOSTOLATE OF SUFFERING

Some of the ablest pastors for whom I ever gave missions were eager to persuade a missioner to visit the sick of the parish. They did this, partly for the purpose of bringing the consolations of religion to people who often exhibited extraordinary sanctity, but even more to encourage them to offer their afflictions for the success of the mission. These same souls might well be recruited in order to obtain blessings for the non-Catholic apostolate. For none are so close to Christ as those who come to Him in sanctified suffering.

On such visits, and from the pulpit, I have discovered lucrative spiritual dividends in reminding the people that of all the methods whereby Christ might have redeemed the world He chose the Way of the Cross. He laid special claim to His crucifixion, calling it "My Hour," as if this were the moment He wished most especially to call His own. Artists sometimes show preference for a particular achievement which, in their estimation, was the highest expression of their genius. The God-Man points to the Cross and says, as it were, "This was my best!" The wisest book of mission science is the life of the Savior of men. In that sacred text we read that the most fruitful of all the instruments employed by Christ was a cross and the most efficacious action of His full life was His death on Calvary. "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all things to myself."[4] His agonizing death was the central action of His earthly career and all else is rendered precious by virtue of its relation to Good Friday.

The greatest teacher that ever lived did not repose exclusive confidence in His own incomparable instructions. He sanctified them by the most heroic and exalted personal sacrifice. Nor can it be otherwise with His disciples. Certainly, they must teach, write, preach, nurse the sick, shelter the homeless, make long journeys, move heaven and earth to establish cordial relations with men, and tax their best resources to persuade and move them. They may maneuver their forces skillfully and show enterprise in exploiting favorable circumstances. But men will remain fundamentally un-

[3] *I Tim.* 2:1-4. [4] *John* 12:22.

moved until the disciples of Christ ascend their own Calvary. For Christ has decreed that we associate ourselves with Him not only in His zeal and prayer but also in His suffering. "If any man will follow me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me."[5]

Some one once complained to the Curé of Ars of failure to influence an obdurate individual. "You have prayed," replied the saint, "you have wept and sighed, but have you fasted? Have you kept vigils? Have you slept on the hard floor? Have you administered the discipline to yourself? Until you have done all this, do not think you have tried every means." This is in the authentic Christian tradition.

We cannot add anything to the total merits of our Lord. He purchased for us an infinite degree of grace by His life, suffering and death. But He has devised a method whereby our sufferings may assist in the distribution of His aid to men. When we offer our daily pains, trials, and labors in union with His cross, He graciously accepts this as expiation for the sins of the world and showers His grace upon the sinful, the indifferent, the unbelieving and on sincere seekers for truth. In this sense, we may say that it is the Whole Christ, the Head and His members, who saves the world. It was all this that St. Paul had in mind when he said: "Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you and fill up those things that are wanting in the sufferings of Christ, in my flesh, for His Body, which is the Church."[6] And one of the most penetrating commentaries on that text comes from Joseph Rickaby, S.J., who remarks: "There is a cross and a passion in His Mystical Body, which He must endure till the day of judgment, and this He portions out age by age among His friends."

ENLISTING IN THE SPIRITUAL CRUSADE

Numerous priests have demonstrated that a robust plan for converts can be maintained in any parish without radical departures from customary procedures or impracticable incursions into the time or energy of the clergy. In line with this principle, it is quite possible to effect a huge increase in appeals for grace in behalf of inquirers simply by employing available parochial channels. A moderate expenditure of effort in applying remedial measures will

[5] *Mark* 8:34. [6] *Col.* 1:24.

go a long way toward satisfying our unappeasable yearning for God's aid.

It is presumed that a priest will whisper an entreaty during his Mass and recitation of the Office. And many imitate Francis de Sales who, while conversing with individual Calvinists, offered a silent prayer for their liberation from the spirit of obstinacy and error.

In the course of the year, the Church has designated two specific seasons for the purpose of fostering true Christian Unity: the novena at Pentecost and the Church Unity Octave. Suitable devotions are prescribed at these times. If they are sufficiently emphasized and made engaging they will attract the faithful and swell the chorus of appeal that wins grace. Besides these special exercises, there are the Holy Hour, the local novena, Sunday evening services and those held in Advent, Lent, May, and October. A special prayer for the local convert project might be included on all these occasions. The writer, when entrusted with the inquiry class in one of our parishes, conducted the weekly Holy Hour principally to encourage prayer for the work. An unforeseen result of this constant reminder was the uncommon generosity it inspired in the private devotions of the people. Many who had seldom previously prayed for this intention began to offer a daily rosary, the Stations, or a visit to the Blessed Sacrament for conversions.

In addition, the co-operation of other individuals and groups might be won without much exertion. An occasional visit to the diocesan cloistered convent, to novitiates and communities of religious and to the school children will abundantly repay the effort. A conference concerning the progress of the work and the experiences that invariably accompany it will capture their imagination and assure many a quiet prayer for your designs. A ten-minute talk to the children once brought me a spiritual bouquet that was overwhelming. Penitents of exceptional generosity and daily communicants ought to be encouraged to lend their aid.

In the course of the week, each priest must visit the poor, the shut-ins, the bed-ridden, and the inmates of hospitals and institutions. Many of them are admirably resigned and cheerful in the face of bitter adversity. But they sometimes grow disconsolate at enforced inaction, dispirited at their aimless existence and at their seclusion from the active devotional life of the parish. A few words

might dispel this unfounded despondency, for they are at the controls of the most efficacious of all missionary agencies.

A priest, simply by thoughtfulness in his daily round, may gradually effect a vast improvement in this phase of his apostolate. He must do so, in one way or another, in order to support his own zeal, patience and charity; and to enable inquirers to see the eternal truth and gather determination for decisive action. Men are always pitiable when they approach their labors unprepared or lacking adequate instruments; and it is impossible to conceive a more hopeless task than to aspire to make converts unaided by the rich graces of Christ.

JOHN T. MCGINN, C.S.P.

St. Paul's College,
Washington, D.C.

THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL IN ENGLAND AND THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

Most people think of the Catholic Revival as though it originated with the Oxford Movement; they have been blinded by the brilliant light that surrounds such names as Newman, Ward, Manning, with Wiseman, fresh from Rome, as a sort of lodestar. But in fact the Church which the Oxford men joined was already a vigorous and independent body before they brought to it the added lustre of academic distinction. Newman, unwittingly perhaps, did his co-religionists an injustice in the famous and often-quoted passage from his *Second Spring* sermon. . . .

The story of the Oxford converts becomes, if not meaningless, at any rate mysterious in many of its episodes when no account is taken of this pre-existing life and energy. Wiseman was waiting and watching the event at Oscott—for Oscott, which half a century later was quite capable of housing the seminary for the whole of the South and Midlands, was already in being. . . . But for those who hold that the Oxford Movement started the Catholic Revival the most inexplicable episode is the mysterious appearance, on this assumption, of the Melchisidech-like figure of Father Dominic Barbieri receiving Newman's submission. It can only be explained by realizing the truth that men like Father Dominic, Dr. Gentili and Father George Spencer were already well known as successful and apostolic missionaries.

The Rev. S. J. Gosling, in his introduction to Denis Gwynn's *Lord Shrewsbury, Pugin and the Catholic Revival* (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Book Shop, 1946), pp. xxiii ff.

SEVEN-THIRTY

One solid shove transfers me from kneeling-bench to chair, and the shortest half-hour of the day begins. Time was when even a fifteen-minute meditation was an heroic act—something to be omitted with little excuse and no sense of loss. It seems too bad that it took me so long—I stoop for the marker as it falls from my book—so long to discover that what they told us in the seminary about meditation is all true. About it being so necessary, I mean; and such a well of strength besides. The trouble was, I still hadn't learned to meditate, even at the end of fourth theology. I still was so tangled up in preludes and compositions of time and place and person and practical applications and spiritual nose-gays, that I never quite got around to meditating. The stage-directions were plain enough: the parts to be played by memory and imagination and intellect and will. But somehow it was such a distraction to be on the alert for the cues; and, as likely as not, the suddenly summoned faculty just stood around, as uncertain as I what to do next.

My thumb creases back the pages of Fr. Leen's *In The Likeness of Christ*. (I'm a book mediator, and always will be; one of those undisciplined minds that needs to be firmly tethered while it does its grazing. The texts of Tanquerey and Parente afford all that I know of contemplation, sadly I confess.) My thoughts seem unusually skittish this morning, but Fr. Leen soon will provide the bell-wether to bring them into line. It may take a paragraph, it may take two or three pages, but I know that something will strike me between the eyes. Some sentence will jump out of the page and say, "This is for you, friend," and conscience will take over from there.

What I like about Fr. Leen or Abbot Marmion or Dom Chautard is that they aren't always sneaking up and shouting, "second point," or "Third point," just as one is beginning to see a glimmer of truth in the first point. I wonder who started that three-point business, anyway? True enough, in the seminary we expressly were told that if one point is meaty enough, we should stay with it. Yet every morning in chapel it was three points we got, and no "meditation book" is complete without them. How others may be I cannot say, but my own soul seems to freeze up at the sight of preludes and points marshalled in careful array.

If I were spiritual director in a seminary—well, to begin with, I should perish of fright at the mere prospect. Only think of the flame that must blaze in the heart of the director if he is to kindle all the torches in the choir-stalls about him! But if I did labor under such awful responsibility, I think I should strive to eliminate the reading of formal and set mediations as a community exercise. If a book had to be used, I should use it to fortify myself in private, then meditate aloud with my brethren.

What a one I am to be talking about meditation! I hear the altar-boys coming into the sacristy, whispering carefully so as not to disturb me—and I haven't even started. I can't blame *that* on the seminary. Nor a lot of other things. It's not the seminary's fault that I succumbed so early in my priesthood to the heresy of good works: late hours spent in young people's activities, for example, with consequent late rising and token prayers. I excused myself with the thought of the "wonderful influence" I was having on the youth of the parish, forgetting that God's little finger could accomplish more than all my excited hustling. My vanity made mockery of His grace, while the angels trembled, I am sure, at my brashness.

No use to blame the seminary, either, for my stupendous self-confidence. All those warning that had been dinned into us about pitfalls and dangers; what was all the shouting about, anyway? Why, it was easy to be good. All one had to do was to keep busy. To keep busy. To keep busy. . . . So I thought.

Oh! Oh! There comes the server out to light the candles, and where is my meditation! Well, forgive me dear Lord this once, this once again. And let a bruised reed offer a prayer to Your Sacred Heart for the straight young shoots that are rising to replace us. Teach them, convince them—and if their skulls are as thick as mine, *pound it into them*—that they'll be of no use to You, whatever their talent, unless they drink deep of Your Spirit each morning.

LEO J. TRESE

St. Patrick's Rectory,
Carleton, Mich.

According to the Scripture view of the Church, though all are admitted into her pale, and the rich inclusively, yet, the poor are her members with a particular suitableness, and by a special right.

John Henry Cardinal Newman, in *Historical Sketches,* I, 341.

THE MINISTRY OF THE DIOCESAN PRIESTHOOD

The diocesan priest is a man with a definite objective to realize. That objective is the local Church, perfect in faith and in charity, to be constructed in the place where the *presbyterium* works for Christ under the direction of its episcopal father and ruler. Thus the Catholic company within which the bishop places the individual diocesan priest is, with all of its limitations and imperfections, the material out of which God wills that he should labor to construct the perfect household of God, the kind of local Church Our Lord desires in this world.

The sum of all the activity the diocesan priest must expend upon and for his people in order to carry out the commission God has given him by placing him in the *presbyterium* constitutes his sacerdotal ministry. The Catholic Church instructs us about the kinds of work that enter into the ministry of the *presbyterium* when, in the ceremony of sacerdotal ordination, the bishop states that the priest "must offer [the sacrifice of the Mass], bless, preside, preach, and baptize."[1] All of these activities on the part of the diocesan priest must contribute towards the edification or construction of the local Church, perfect in faith and in charity.

If, however, we consider the immediate concrete purposes to which the diocesan priest should apply the various acts of his ministry, we find that these can be classified under four headings. (1) The diocesan priest has a distinctive doctrinal ministry, since he is charged with the responsibility of instructing his people in the true faith of Jesus Christ. (2) The *presbyterium* of a local Church has a definite missionary function, since it is commissioned to "edify" a local Church well enough instructed in the faith and ardent enough in charity for those outside the Church to desire sincerely that these persons should receive fellowship with Our Lord in His *ecclesia*. (3) The unitive commission of the diocesan priesthood comes from the obligation laid upon the *presbyterium* to build the company of the faithful into family, joined within itself and to Our Lord in the bonds of mutual charity. (4) Finally the diocesan priesthood must work at its perfective function of bringing each member of the local Church to the fulness of the life of divine grace.

[1] *The Roman Pontifical.*

The full theological meaning and dignity of the diocesan priesthood's ministry can best be seen when we consider the activities of the *presbyterium* in terms of these four functions.

THE REALITY OF THE SACERDOTAL OBJECTIVE

When we say that the diocesan priest is charged with the responsibility of perfecting or edifying the local Church, we do not mean to imply that the Catholic Church, in any place or at any time in this world, can be lacking in essential perfection. The basic and fundamental perfection of the Catholic Church comes from the fact that Our Lord Jesus Christ actually dwells within that society as its teacher and its ruler. Thus the Church is completely and perfectly God's kingdom on earth always. The apostolic work of the bishop and his *presbyterium* is in no way directed towards an increase in the essential perfection of the company of Our Lord's disciples.

What the bishop and the *presbyterium* seek to accomplish in the pursuance of their immediate objective is the ever more complete and perfect incorporation of the members of the local Church into Christ, their head. It is possible to have the individual member of the Catholic Church advance in the life of spiritual perfection. It is also possible to have the members as a body progress in the corporate life of charity God demands from them. The efforts of the diocesan priesthood are to be expended in this direction, and in no other.

Furthermore we must remember that in working to make his people ardent supporters of the missionary labors of the Catholic Church, the diocesan priest is in no way attempting to make the Church more Catholic or universal. The Church itself gains nothing in its *essential* Catholicity or in its *essential* holiness from the addition of new converts. The gain or benefit comes to the man who enters the communion of the *ecclesia* and thus becomes a partaker of the fellowship of Christ Our Lord. Hence it is entirely misleading to speak of the Catholic Church of our day as in some measure incomplete or lacking in Catholicity by reason of the fact that the majority of men in many races remain outside the fold. The perfect Church of Jesus Christ is able to work for God more effectively when new members are added to its company and when the members already in the communion advance in corporate and

individual perfection of faith and of charity. Nevertheless it remains true that the Church itself derives its perfection in holiness from the indwelling of Jesus Christ, and it is, as it always has been, the one and only Catholic society of the disciples.

Still less accurate is the teaching of those men who would place the perfection of the Church in some mythical "Catholic centre" or in the totality of Christianity in all ages and localities. These writers would have us believe that the Church, as it exists here and now in an individual Catholic diocese, lacks something of the inherent perfection of the Christian society. They contrast "popular Catholicism" with what they regard as the true Catholicism of their "centre" and hold that this actually existent Catholic society has deviated from the truth in approximately the same manner as the various heretical and schismatic sects. Their position is theologically absurd because, within the Catholic Church wherever it exists, Our Lord Himself lives and dwells.

THE DOCTRINAL MINISTRY OF THE DIOCESAN PRIEST

God wills that the local Church, like the Church Catholic as a whole, should be well established in the faith of Jesus Christ Our Lord. The local Church, as a social unit, should have an adequate grasp of the divine truths that constitute the message of the Catholic Church. The members of this local Church should be well enough instructed in these truths "to be ready always to satisfy every one that asketh you a reason of that hope that is in you."[2] They should be able to discern teaching hostile to their own divine revealed truth, and they should be prepared to shut that hostile and erroneous teachings out of their hearts and lives. Furthermore, in their triumphant and enthusiastic orthodoxy, they should be in a position to utilize the doctrines of faith in the government of their own activity. For the local Church perfect in faith, the divinely revealed message must not and cannot be a dead letter. It must be the motive force for all of its life.

The authorized teachers of the divine faith in any local Church are the bishop and his *presbyterium.* The bishop holds this position by reason of his membership in the apostolic *collegium.* His diocesan priests are, by virtue of the divine constitution of the Church itself,

[2] *I Pet.* 3:15.

a sacerdotal brotherhood formed *unice et ex integro* for the purpose of aiding the bishop in his ministry. Together with the bishop and subject to him, the diocesan priests are responsible for the vigor and clarity of the faith in the local Church. This remains true even in a day like our own when the people have access to a great number of papers, magazines, and books, written by Catholics with the avowed intention of explaining the Church's faith. Under the leadership of the bishop, the diocesan priests are responsible before God for the spiritual enlightenment of their flocks. They can never acquit themselves of their responsibility in a manner pleasing to Our Lord by the facile process of giving a sweeping recommendation to "Catholic books" or "books by Catholics."

For the Catholic laity, reading must always be a subsidiary, though of course an important, means for acquiring a proper understanding of the Church's divine message. As a result, it will be impossible to give the people of a diocese the richness in Christ, "in all utterance and in all knowledge,"[3] requisite for a Church that possesses the perfection of faith demanded by God, apart from a clear and doctrinally accurate and adequate course of preaching by the members of the diocesan *presbyterium*. The preaching ministry of the diocesan priesthood must thus be directed to the accomplishment of this divinely revealed objective. It must be such as to form a local Church perfect in the faith of Jesus Christ. All that does not lead to the fashioning of the diocese into a Church perfect in faith must be excluded from the doctrinal ministry of the *presbyterium*.

The work of the diocesan priesthood to perfect the people of the local Church in the divine faith is a matter of primary importance in the Catholic Church. Other priests may be commissioned by the bishop to preach the word of God in his diocese, but no other body of men within the entire society of Our Lord's disciples is responsible for the accuracy and perfection of the faith in a local Church in the same way as the *presbyterium* of that local Church. God has formed His Church in such a way that this brotherhood, and none other, is directly charged with the task of devoting all of its energies and efforts in aiding the bishop, the divinely commissioned teacher of the local Church. The vigor and the correctness of the divine faith in any diocese is, consequently, something for

[3] *I Cor.* 1:5.

which the *presbyterium* of that diocese and its members will certainly be held accountable by God.

During the course of the Church's long history, the doctrinal mission of the *presbyterium* has never been a really easy affair. It is particularly difficult in our own time. We live in an era when the disintegrating Protestantism around us for the most part acknowledges merely a symbolic or relative value in Christian dogma. During the lifetime of our own generation, this error crept into the membership of the Catholic Church itself, and Pope Pius X condemned it as one of the aspects of the chain of heresies called Modernism. It would be idle to imagine that the condemnation of Modernism, during the first decade of our century, put a stop once and for all to the influence of non-Catholic indifference to religious truth and orthodoxy upon Catholics weak or ill-instructed in their faith.

That influence exists and operates vigorously today. Our people came in contact with it through a literature and society that seem to take it for granted that all religious teaching is, in the last analysis, merely the expression of some religious sentiment. The diocesan priesthood, armed with the truth of Jesus Christ, is faced with the formidable and glorious work of realizing its divine objective of a Church perfect in faith in the midst of a world that will hardly consider the possibility of religious truth.

The individual diocesan priest accomplishes his doctrinal mission and fulfils his divinely imposed responsibilities only when he utilizes all of the resources of sacred theology to insure the accuracy and the adequacy of the instructions he is privileged to give to his people. The disciples of Christ, the members of the Catholic Church, have a God-given right to receive the teachings of their divine Master, clearly and correctly. Sacred theology is the one naturally attainable science containing this body of doctrine. The priest who fails to avail himself of this resource in preparing for his sermons to the people runs the very serious risk of misleading them about the teachings of Christ.

Obviously a great deal of genuine theological study is required for the preparation of that type of sermon which the diocesan priest is commissioned to deliver. And, what is most important, that study is required in at least as great measure when the projected sermon is to be preached to the poor as when it is to be delivered to a reputedly more cultured congregation. Riches or higher education

will never give a Catholic a right to any doctrine over and above that to which the poorest of the disciples is entitled. The type of spiritual snobbery that looks down upon instructions or sermons to the poor or to the ordinary workingmen is a direct violation of the spirit and the commission of the *presbyterium,* to which, with the bishop, the poor of Christ are especially entrusted.

THE MISSIONARY FUNCTION OF THE DIOCESAN PRIEST

The bishop and his diocesan priests work for the formation of a spiritually prosperous Church of God in their own territory. A spiritually prosperous local Church of God is one in which the people themselves seek, with all the powers and resources at their disposal, the entrance of new members into the society of the disciples. In its Code of Canon Law, the Catholic Church commands that "Ordinaries and parish priests should consider non-Catholics resident in their own dioceses or parishes as entrusted (commendatos) to them in the Lord."[4] This mandate is an expression of the divine law itself. God wills that the bishop should rule his Church in the charity of Christ. It is impossible to have the love of Christ without desiring the salvation of the men and women for whom Our Lord died on Calvary. When a great many of these men and women are neighbors and fellow citizens of the bishop and of his flock, the charity of Christ manifestly demands that the bishop's *presbyterium* should do all in its power to bring these people into the company of God outside of which there is no salvation.

Since the *presbyterium* is a priestly brotherhood formed *unice et ex integro* to aid the bishop, its father and ruler, in his sacerdotal task, the *presbyterium* itself must labor for conversions to the true Church of Jesus Christ, especially among the non-Catholics of the region within which the *presbyterium* functions. The love of charity that prescribes this effort for conversions must be extended even to the bitterest enemies of the Church itself. Thus, within the confines of any local Church or diocese, there is no man to whom the bishop and his *presbyterium* are not striving to bring the blessing of heaven through membership in Christ's Church militant.

The objective of the bishop and of his diocesan priests, however, demands far more than an ardent missionary spirit in the *presby-*

[4] *Codex iuris canonici,* can. 1350, n. 1.

terium itself. They are commissioned to work for the formation or the edification of a local Church which, as a social unit, strives effectively to convert non-Catholics. The blue-print that God gives the diocesan priesthood, the description of the perfect Church, shows a people accurately instructed in Our Lord's teachings and united in ties of divine charity. When the people of a local Church, as distinct from the bishop and his *collegium* of diocesan priests, are tepid about the work of the propagation of the faith, that tepidity is an infallible indication either of ignorance in matters of faith or of a failing charity for God.

To love God sincerely is to will that He be glorified forever in the company of those who enjoy the beatific vision. To love Christ is to desire ardently that those for whom He died may rejoice always in the fruits of the redemption. Furthermore, because God actually wills that all men should serve and love Him in the Church militant, in the company of His Son on this earth, and because there is no salvation apart from the true Church of Christ, the love of God necessarily demands and desires the accomplishment of the divine will in and through the work of the missionary apostolate.

Thus, if the local Church lives ardently the life of divine grace and charity, and if it has been so instructed that the people realize the real and vital necessity of the Catholic communion, that local Church will inevitably manifest sincere enthusiasm for the missionary efforts of the *ecclesia*. If, on the other hand, it is tepid and remiss in love for God; if a considerable and influential number of its members have fallen from grace; or if the people of that Christian community are so ill-informed on matters of the faith that they have come to imagine that the work of the propagation of the faith is simply one of the many devotions within the Church which are laudable, but in no way requisite for the Church as a whole or for any individual within it, that local Church will inevitably be unenthusiastic for the work of conversion. A local Church or an individual Catholic strong in charity and enlightened by an accruate knowledge of divine revelation will, with absolute certainty, be ardently and genuinely interested in bringing men into the company of Christ within His Church.

Since charity is essentially an active thing, the enthusiasm of the well-ordered local Church for the propagation of the faith must necessarily manifest itself in sincere efforts on the part of the Catholic community as a whole, and on the part of the various indi-

viduals within that community, to do what they can to cause non-Catholics to enter the company of Christ. By the order of charity, the first beneficiaries of this love for God on the part of the local Church must inevitably be the non-Catholic people of their own locality. Certainly the local Church must pray sincerely for the conversion of these individuals, since prayer is, after all, the expression to God of our inmost and basic desires. Charity is the dominant motive in the life of grace, and since the conversion of non-Catholic neighbors is something desired in the very act of charity, those who love God will pray for this intention.

Prayer, like charity itself, is necessarily a dominant factor in the life of grace. Hence the people of God within a local Church, in praying sincerely for the spiritual well-being of their neighbors, will necessarily do everything in their power to bring the truth of Christ to those of their own neighborhood. Thus, if the local Church acts as Our Lord wills that it should, each individual within it will co-operate in the apostolic work of the propagation of the faith in prayer and in deed.

THE DIOCESAN PRIEST AND THE FOREIGN MISSIONS

Although the local Church is primarily interested in the conversion of its own non-Catholic neighbors, it does not and cannot limit its charitable attention to these people. Basically and essentially the local Church is a unit in the Catholic Church militant. Each Catholic in the local Church is meant to desire in charity the success of the missionary activity of the Church throughout the entire world. In those sections of the world in which the Church is not as yet perfectly and completely established, the portions of the earth not divided into individual local dioceses, the missionary activity of the Church is entirely under the direction of the Vicar of Christ, the Roman Pontiff.

The Holy Father is truly the Bishop of the Catholic Church, having true and episcopal power of jurisdiction over every one of the faithful. The universal Church of God on earth is the household or the family of Christ, over which the Bishop of Rome presides as Our Lord's vicar. Hence the members of the Church, as Christ's disciples, must be interested in the spiritual good towards their divine Master. They must desire, pray for, and, according to their

individual capacities, work for the spread of the true Church throughout the world.

Because the local Church is essentially and inherently a part of the Church universal, the objective of the diocesan priest in the individual diocese demands that he work to render his people effectively cognizant of the world-wide functions of Catholicism. Thus, despite the fact that the *presbyterium* is fashioned by God to aid the bishop in his conduct of a local Church, the orientation of the diocesan priesthood is in no way circumscribed and limited by the borders of the individual diocese. Paradoxically enough, it is precisely by reason of the fact that the ministry of the *presbyterium* is essentially diocesan that its interests and its charity must be coextensive with those of the Church Catholic. The diocese has neither meaning nor worth apart from its position in the universal Church. The man who is commissioned to act as the instrument of the bishop in caring for the local Church must, in order to do his work as Our Lord wills that it should be done, concern himself whole-heartedly and essentially with the life of the entire Church militant.

Recently there have been some theologians who have decried the movement towards a recognition of the spirituality of the diocesan priesthood on the ground that such a spirituality would be limited and un-Catholic. They have imagined that this doctrine would be a kind of *spiritualité de clocher,* tending to attach the secular priest to his own locality in such a way as to detract from his affection for and interest in the Church universal. Archbishop Guerry has assured the men troubled by such fears that there is small danger of provincialism or over-specialization within the Church coming from the diocesan ministry and its spirituality.[5] The men who voiced their anxiety that attention to the spirituality of the diocesan priesthood would prove in some way hostile to the unity of the Catholic Church seem not to have adverted to the theological teaching about the position of the diocese (and hence of its presbyterium) in the universal society of Our Lord's disciples.

Obviously the diocesan priest labors for the fostering of the missionary spirit in the people of his local Church through his sacramental ministry. The sacraments, giving divine grace *ex opere operato,* increase the perfection and the fervor of charity in the faithful who receive them, and in the Church itself. Nevertheless the

[5] Cf. *La Maison Dieu,* III, 81.

upbuilding of the Church, which is the work of achieving the objective of the *presbyterium,* demands a great deal of effort by the priest along lines other than those of the sacramental ministry alone. The priest must bring his people to understand the true revealed teaching on the real and vital necessity of the Catholic Church for salvation. He must bring them to recognize the requisites for membership in the true Church of Jesus Christ. Finally, he must bring them to see the meaning and the implications of divine charity itself.

Particularly in our own day, instruction along these three lines is badly needed by the Catholic people. What at any rate appears to be the most dangerous doctrinal phenomenon in modern Christendom is the tendency to play down and to underrate the importance of the true and visible Church of Jesus Christ. In the writings of some "Catholic intellectuals" this tendency results in what is for all intents and purposes an explaining away of the axiom *"extra ecclesiam nulla salus,"* so as to make it appear that really the Church is not necessary at all. Others, better skilled in the technique of religious writing, make the axiom itself the excuse for the crudest form of latitudinarianism by teaching that no man can be saved without actually being a member of the Church, and at the same time suggesting that, *de facto,* persons can be at the same time non-Catholics and members of Our Lord's true Church. The unfortunate Catholic who accepts this false teaching in either of the two forms mentioned will obviously not be in a position to sustain the logical and correct Catholic attitude with reference to the work of the propagation of the faith. If he has fallen into the error of believing that the visible and organized Church of the Roman communion is not really requisite for salvation, then he can not logically and consistently see in the missionary effort of the Church the supreme expression of the Church's charity for those outside of its own fold.

Likewise the people of our own time must have continual and accurate theological instruction on divine charity itself. There is an observable tendency at the present time to think of charity almost exclusively in terms of a devotional exercise, and to measure the perfection of our love for God primarily in terms of what we should do or fail to do under conditions which are not, and never will be, existent. In order that the people of God in the local Church may accomplish their mission of charity to non-Catholics through an ardent co-operation in the work of the propagation of the faith,

these people must be brought to realize that charity is essentially a dynamic thing, impelling sincere efforts for the good of those whom God calls into His kingdom, in heaven and on earth. They must be taught the truth that the ultimate and essential social effect of divine charity is an intention to work so that the men and women for whom Our Lord died may have the eternal gift of the beatific vision.

THE UNITIVE FUNCTION OF THE DIOCESAN PRIEST

Christ wills that His Church on earth should manifest itself for what it actually is, the family or the household of God. For that reason, time and time again, He insisted that His followers should love one another. In his various epistles St. Paul brought out the teaching of the divine Master by inculcating His command that the disciples, the members of His *ecclesia,* should hold each other in real affection. The command that the members of the Church should love one another constitutes the basic instruction in the epistles of St. John.

Our Lord also taught that we should love our enemies, and we have St. Paul's instruction to do good to all men. All of these commands, of course, are expressions of the basic and general mandate of charity, according to which the disciples of Christ are ordered to love God and to love their neighbors as themselves. Fundamentally, then, there is no reason in the world able to justify the withholding of charity from any man or woman in the world. To hate our fellow men is to cancel out and destroy the love of God in our own hearts.

Nevertheless, there is such a thing as an order of charity. By the law of charity itself, we are commanded to give a special love and affection to certain persons in the world. Thus, for example, the divine precept of charity requires us to have and to show to our own families and our own neighbors a stronger, more intense, and more effective love than that which we should have for persons in no way directly connected with our own lives.

As the family or the household of God, into which we have been received as brothers by Our Lord Himself, the Catholic Church, the one society of Christ's disciples, brings its members together in a unity which, though supernatural, remains more perfect and real than the union achieved in any other way. Hence, if we are to follow out and obey God's command of charity, we must have a special

and dominant affection among ourselves as members of the Catholic Church. We must love the Church itself, and love our brothers, our fellow members of this Church, with an affection that is outstanding. If our love for the Church and for our fellow-disciples of Christ in it is not noticeably strong; if our family affection within the household of God is not powerful and manifest enough to contribute towards making the *ecclesia* a society so perfectly united in charity as to constitute an indication to the world that Christ's message is actually a divine revelation and that ours is really the company of Our Lord's followers; we are being recreant to the duties our membership in the Church has imposed upon us.

This need for a specially powerful love of charity for the Church and among Catholics is manifest from an examination of the New Testament texts about love for each other, for outsiders, and for our enemies. As Fr. Deman, O.P., points out in a brilliant article in *La vie spirituelle,* the texts that tell of the necessity of love for our enemies insist upon the incompatibility of hatred for any man with charity for God. Those, on the other hand, which deal with the necessity of mutual love and affection among the members of the society of the disciples speak of a special and most intense union of love, a true bond of family affection.[6]

The immediate disciples of Our Lord understood His teaching in this sense. The book of the Acts of the Apostles informs us that, directly after His ascension into heaven, the eleven apostles "were persevering with one mind in prayer, with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren."[7] After the membership in the Church had been multiplied by reason of the influx of converts on the first Christian Pentecost, we are told that the disciples "were persevering in the doctrine of the apostles and in the communion of the breaking of bread and in prayers." Three times in the Pauline epistles[8] and twice in the letters of St. Peter,[9] the members of the Church are commanded and entreated to have a brotherly love (φιλαδελφία) for one another. In the epistle to the Romans, St. Paul begs his Christians to have this love of the

[6] Cf. *La vie spirituelle,* CLXXV, 5 (Dec., 1946), pp. 678 ff.

[7] *Acts* 1:14.

[8] Cf. *Rom.* 12:10; *I Thes.* 4:9; *Heb.* 13:1.

[9] Cf. *I Pet.* 1:22; *II Pet.* 1:7. The word is found twice in the text of St. Peter's Second Epistle.

brotherhood make them φιλόστοργοι, that is, possessed of that tender affection which belongs within a family, towards one another.[10]

The Church of God needs building up or "edification" in any place where the need for this φιλαδελφία among Catholics is not recognized. Thus the objective of the diocesan priesthood in any place or time is the formation and the perfection of the Church along the lines of this love of the brotherhood. That task is rendered particular difficult in our day by reason of the same tendency which has militated against a recognition of the real necessity and the visibility of God's Church in this world. The forces which seek to turn men away from the salvation of Christ have tried, sometimes with at least a modicum of success, to deceive Catholics into a position in which they imagine that the Church's social bonds are not very important in everyday life.

Hence we have, in our own time, the amazing spectacle of Catholic periodicals and Catholic writers protesting against what they sometimes designate as group-consciousness or group-solidarity within the true Church of Jesus Christ, and the spectacle of a Catholic author solemnly warning his readers against an excessive attachment to the real and visible Church, at the expense of that figment of the imagination he calls the invisible church. Fr. Deman has remarked the apparent prevalence, in our own time, of a tendency to exalt the love for those outside the *ecclesia* over that which is due to its own members.[11] We live in a time when ill-instructed but sometimes influential Catholic writers seem to burn with a desire to exalt and to exult in every good that can be found outside the visible Roman communion which alone is the Church militant of God, and to blacken and calumniate whatever they can within it.

We must not allow ourselves to forget the fact that the most important papal pronouncement of our era, the present Holy Father's *Mystici corporis,* ends in and centers around a plea to love the Church. Where this genuine and dominant love of the Church, and the sincere and effective love of Catholics for one another do not exist, the people of that local Church are not acting as God wills that they should. They are being recreant to their duties as Christians. Where the need for such φιλαδελφία within the Catholic Church and for it is misconstrued or denied, we have, not merely an undesir-

[10] Cf. *Rom.* 12:10.

[11] Cf. Deman, *loc. cit.*

able situation, but an actual error about or denial of the divine revelation itself.

Hence no aspect of the diocesan priesthood's objective is more important than the living and effective union of charity which it seeks to foster in the local Church of God. For the attainment of this objective, the *presbyterium* must have recourse to a complete and fully accurate thological instruction about the Church of Jesus Christ. The men who believe that non-Catholics should be treated with greater kindness and charity than members of the *ecclesia* suffer, in great measure, from a faulty and inadequate concept of the Church. Unless they are able to know what Our Lord revealed about the Church they will not be in a position to fulfill their obligations as members of the Church. Unless they are able to see the Church as the ἀγάπη there is little likelihood that they will appreciate the honor God has given them by calling them to membership within it.

When we speak of a local Church ardent in the love of the brotherhood as the objective of the diocesan priesthood, we must not lose sight of the fact that, by the command of Christ, this charity must be active and effective. Due in great measure to inferior religious teaching, there is a manifest tendency today to think of loving our brothers as a task to be accomplished solely in the process of prayer. Some people seem to imagine that a man has sufficient love for his brother if he makes no move to exempt that brother from the mass of mankind for whom his prayer is offered. The truth of the matter is that the love we are meant to have for our brothers in the Church enjoins definite and practical responsibilities. St. Peter mentioned hospitality to Christians as something intimately connected with charity in the Church.

> But before all things have a constant mutual charity among yourselves: for charity covereth a multitude of sins.
>
> Using hospitality one towards another, without murmuring,
>
> As every man hath received grace, ministering the same one to another: as good stewards of the manifold grace of God.[12]

Hospitality meant, in apostolic times as now, providing shelter for those who need it. There is no reason to suppose that the duty of hospitality was any easier when St. Peter wrote his epistle than it

[12] *I Pet.* 4:8-10.

is today. It required effort, and the overcoming of temptation to laziness and indifference, as St. Peter's warning against grudging hospitality would indicate. Yet the love of the brethren, without which a man is only a disloyal and recreant member of Christ's *ecclesia,* demanded that hospitality.

It is interesting to see how the inspired books of the New Testament describe this love of the brotherhood and its implications. In the first place, St. Paul insists in his Epistle to the Romans, that this affection for our fellow members of God's family requires that we should be extremely careful not to disedify or scandalize weaker brothers by our words or actions.

> Let us not therefore judge one another any more. But judge this rather, that you put not a stumbling block or a scandal in your brother's way . . .
>
> Therefore let us follow after the things that are of peace and keep the things that are of edification, one towards another . . .
>
> It is good not to eat flesh and not to drink wine: nor any thing whereby thy brother is offended or scandalized or made weak.[13]

Again he writes, to the Corinthians:

> But take heed lest perhaps this your liberty become a stumbling-block to the weak.
>
> For if a man see him that hath knowledge sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not his conscience, being weak, be emboldened to eat those things which are sacrificed to idols?
>
> And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ hath died?
>
> Now when you sin thus against the brethren and wound their weak conscience, you sin against Christ.[14]

What the people who understress the need for "group-solidarity" among the Catholics of our own day fail to appreciate is the fact that St. Paul demanded the exercise of fraternal love within the Church precisely under those circumstances in which the individual Catholic could find some sort of excuse or reason to dispense from it. The weak brothers to whom St. Paul refers in the Romans and the First Corinthians are the troublesome sort of people who would be disedified by their more intelligent fellow-Christians' performance of acts which were perfectly acceptable in themselves. Yet, on this

[13] *Rom.* 14:13, 19, 21.

[14] *I Cor.* 8:9-12.

point, the intelligent Christian is warned and commanded to govern his activities in such a way that the less perfectly instructed could come to no spiritual harm by reason of their doings.

Indeed, according to St. Paul, the Christian must be prepared to suffer real wrong from his brother. The sort of forebearance which, within the natural human family, would influence one member to suffer injury at the hands of another rather than to bring disedification and to cause dissension within the group by defending his own rights, is made mandatory within the supernatural family of God, the Catholic Church.

> Already indeed there is plainly a fault among you, that you have lawsuits one with another. Why do you not rather take wrong? Why do you not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?
> But you do wrong and defraud: and that to your brethren.[15]

In the Epistle to the Colossians, the Christians are urged to continue

> Bearing with one another and forgiving one another, if any have a complaint against another. Even as the Lord hath forgiven you, so do you also.[16]

It is the will of God that the disciples of Jesus Christ should act justly, not only towards one another and towards the Church itself, but also towards those outside the fold. "Be without offence," St. Paul wrote to his Corinthians, "to the Jews and to the Gentiles and to the Church of God."[17] Nevertheless, according to the Apostle of the Gentiles, the Christian is expected to show himself particularly beneficent to his fellow-members of Christ's Mystical Body. "Therefore, whilst we have time, let us work good to all men, but especially (μάλιστα δὲ) to those who are of the household of the faith."[18]

The love of the brotherhood which God commands within His own Church is essentially a positive thing. It is not fulfilled simply by the process of refraining from giving scandal to the weaker brethren, or merely by patiently accepting injuries and indignities from fellow-members of our own supernatural family. God wills that the individual local Church should consist of Christians who work together, sincerely and enthusiastically, for His glory.

[15] *I Cor.* 6:7-8.
[16] *Col.* 3:13.
[17] *I Cor.* 10:32.
[18] *Gal.* 6:10.

Now the God of patience and of comfort grant you to be of one mind, one towards another, according to Jesus Christ:

That with one mind and with one mouth you may glorify God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Wherefore, receive one another, as Christ also hath received you, unto the honor of God.[19]

St. Paul made it perfectly clear that the people of the local Church would please God only if they profited from the grace that came to them from Christ by manifesting a perfect unanimity of sentiment in working for Him. The diocesan *presbyterium* must work to present to God a local Church like that which St. Paul prayed the faithful at Philippi might become.

Fulfil ye my joy, that you may be of one mind, having the same charity, being of one accord, agreeing in sentiment.

Let nothing be done through contention: neither by vain glory. But in humility, let each esteem others better than themselves:

Each one not considering the things that are his own, but those that are other men's.[20]

It is, moreover, the business of the diocesan priest to work for the spiritual edification of a local Church within which there will be no infringement of brotherly love by reason of favoring the rich and powerful over the poor. A local Church which exalts the rich at the expense of the poor sins against its divine commission.

My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ of glory, with respect to persons.

For if there shall come into your assembly a man having a golden ring, in fine apparel; and there shall come in also a poor man in mean attire:

And you have respect to him that is clothed with the fine apparel and shall say to him: Sit thou here well; but say to the poor man: Stand thou there, or: Sit under my footstool:

Do you not judge within yourselves, and are become judges of unjust thoughts?

Hearken, my dearest brethren: Hath not God chosen the poor in this world, rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom which God hath promised to them that love him?[21]

Finally, it is God's will that the disciples of Christ should preserve themselves free from any division of charity based upon the distinc-

[19] *Rom.* 15:5-7.

[20] *Phil.* 2:2-4.

[21] *James* 2:1-5.

tion of the clergy from the laity. Thus it falls within the field of the diocesan priesthood's ministry to labor towards the eradication of any anti-clericalism which might enter into the flock of Christ. God commands that the Catholic people should have a special affection for those men who are their ministers for Christ.

> And we beseech you, brethren, to know them who labor among you and are over you in the Lord and admonish you:
> That you esteem them more abundantly in charity, for their work's sake. Have peace with them.[22]

Obviously, the formation of a local Church perfectly united in the bonds of charity constitutes a great and essential part of the ministry of the *presbyterium*. The first and the most important means the priest must use for the attainment of this end is the force of example. There will be little incentive in the direction of anti-clericalism where the priest himself manifests a sincere affection in Christ for all the members of his flock. And, where the priest shows himself completely solicitous for the spiritual welfare of all the people he is called upon to serve, he thereby makes a tremendous and unique contribution towards the formation of a local Church united in the bonds of fraternal charity. By his example in this direction, the priest becomes "a pattern of the flock from the heart."[23]

Furthermore, in order to influence his people to love one another and to love the Church itself as God wills that they should, the priest must counteract the tendencies of the Church's enemies by giving his people an accurate and adequate instruction on the nature of divine charity and on the character of God's kingdom in this world. The people will never understand that Catholic love of the brotherhood is a part of Christian life unless they realize that the Church is actually the company or assembly within which Our Lord resides, and within which alone we may gain fellowship with Him. Furthermore, they must be made aware of the fact that the life of charity demands a real and special affection for the household of God and for its members. They should be brought to realize that the present Holy Father's encyclical, the *Mystici Corporis,* centers the divine command to love the true Church of Jesus Christ.

[22] *I Thes.* 5:12-13.

[23] *I Pet.* 5:3.

THE PERFECTIVE FUNCTION OF THE DIOCESAN PRIEST

The objective of the Catholic episcopate, and hence of the diocesan priesthood, is a local Church composed of Christians who live the divine life of sanctifying grace in all of its perfection. Hence the ministry of the diocesan priesthood involves the effort, on the part of each member of the *presbyterium,* to influence and to bring, in so far as possible, every one of the persons subject to his ministry to the life of sanctity. The diocesan priest cannot be satisfied with his work as long as one of the faithful over whom he has been placed in charge lacks any of the supernatural perfection God wills that he should possess.

On the negative side, the ministry of the *presbyterium* in this direction involves a fight against sin, and of course against complacency in sin. In every period of the Church's history there have been certain offences against the law of God which have been particularly appealing to the fashion of the moment. Long ago, for instance, the fashion of the world opposed to Our Lord tended to consider the sin of duelling as something practically acceptable and even necessary. In our own times, such vices as "birth control" and civic dishonesty are all-too-frequently looked upon as allowable. The diocesan priest's mission to form a perfect local Church of God among his own people makes it incumbent upon him to insist upon the divinely revealed law in all of its force and perfection. It is his business to see to it that his people may never be led into complacancy towards sin through any failure of his to announce the truth of God.

Furthermore, the priest must strive by every means within his power to make his own people avid for perfection in Christ. His work is incomplete as long as any one under his charge is content with laxity and imperfection in the service of Our Lord. He must make his people aware of the fact that God calls every one of them, not merely to salvation, but to the life of perfection in divine grace.

Thus the ministry God has confided to the diocesan priesthood within the Catholic Church involves accurate and adequate instruction and a great many other elements as well. The charge God has given to every member of the diocesan *presbyterium* is, in the last analysis, identical with that He gave to the young bishop, St. Timothy, by the pen of St. Paul.

I charge thee, before God and Jesus Christ, who shall judge the living and the dead, by his coming and his kingdom:

Preach the word: be instant in season, out of season: reprove, entreat, rebuke in all patience and doctrine.[24]

Thus every element of exhortation and reproval must be combined with the correct and sufficient preaching of God's revealed truth to all of His people and with the administration of His sacraments in order that the God-given ministry of the diocesan priest may be accomplished in the society of the disciples of Jesus Christ Our Lord. The bishop's *presbyterium* has no other assignment in the Church of God than the completion of this ministry. The individual diocesan priest is responsible before God and obligated, by his very office, to give his life in this definite ministry for the accomplishment of the objective, the perfect local Church of God.

Finally, St. Paul's command to Timothy to "be instant, in season, out of season (ἐπίστηθι εὐκαίρως ἀκαίρως)" is a divinely inspired reminder that the work God has imposed upon the bishop and the *presbyterium* of each local Church is definitely a full-time affair. Those who have been called by God to the apostolic life have been assigned to the most important and urgent task in the world. Because of their position in the Church, they are responsible to God Himself for the spiritual welfare of the Catholic people over whom they have been placed, and they are likewise directly charged with the duty of bringing as many people as possible into the fold of Christ. Hence there is no portion of their time that they can legitimately withdraw from the work of their ministry. The responsibility for building up the Church of God is with them always. All of the time and all of the energy and talent God has given to these His chosen servants must be expended generously and enthusiastically for the furtherance of our Lord's work in His Church. Only thus may the ministry of the diocesan priest be fulfilled.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[24] *II Tim.* 4:1-2.

Answers to Questions

THE TITULAR FEAST AND ALL SOULS' DAY

Question: The titular feast of our church is St. Malachy, which is listed in the Martyrology for Nov. 3. This year, 1947, since Sunday comes on the second of November, the regular calendar has for Nov. 3 the Commemoration of All Souls. What becomes of our titular feast? May it supplant All Souls' Day this year?

Answer: All Souls' Day is of such importance that no feast, even even of the highest rank, may take precedence over it. Only when the second of November is a Sunday is the observance of All Souls transferred to the following day. This will be the case in November of the present year, 1947. The rubrics of the Breviary, under date of Nov. 2, provide that even when the observance of All Souls' Day is postponed to Monday (when Nov. 2 falls on Sunday), it still has preference over all feasts occurring on Nov. 3. These feasts are either omitted or transferred, according to their rank. The feast of the titular of a church being a *duplex primae classis cum octava communi,* in the case of such a conflict it will be transferred to the first day which will allow it. In the present instance, that day will be Nov. 4. The Ordo, therefore, for 1947 for a church whose titular is St. Malachy will read as follows:

Nov. 3. *Feria 2. Ad Vesp. I Vesp. de seq. nulla commem.*
Nov. 4. *Fer. 3. Alb. S. Malachiae Ep. Conf. Dupl. I C1.*
Ad Laudes: Commem. S. Caroli.
Ad Missam: Commem. S. Caroli in Missis privatis tantum.
Ad Vesp. II Vesp. de S. Malachia nulla commem.

GENERAL PRINCIPLE GOVERNING FUNCTIONS *CORAM SANCTISSIMO*

In response to several enquiries concerning what devotions may be conducted *coram Sanctissimo solemniter exposito,* we give this conclusion as the result of some study of the legislation of the Church governing the solemn exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. In general, it may be said that while such exposition is in progress, no devotion however salutary, even though it bears relation to the Blessed Sacrament or some associated mystery, like that of the Sacred Passion, may interrupt the constant adoration of the Blessed

Sacrament. So true is this that the Church discourages even the celebration of Mass at the altar on which the Sacred Host is solemnly exposed (cf. S.R.C., decrees 1406; 1421 *ad* 5; 2765; 3124 *ad* 2; 3448 *ad* 1; 3482; 3505 *ad* 1; and one as recent as that of April 17, 1919). The *mens* of the Sacred Congregation has been consistently against Mass *coram Sanctissimo* unless by way of exception in cases of necessity or by reason of special indult. Gardellini holds that the celebration of Mass at the altar of exposition does not justify the distribution of Holy Communion at that altar *(In instr. clement.,* 12, nn. 1-7; 14, n. 3). Hence, even so Eucharistic a function as the distribution of Holy Communion is not considered proper at an altar where the Blessed Sacrament is exposed. If a sermon is preached during the period of exposition, it must have some reference to the Blessed Sacrament and the exposition must be technically discontinued by veiling the monstrance (cf. *Instr. clement.* XXXII). From these observations it will be clear that an exercise, like that of the Stations of the Cross, which, though a devotion to the closely associated mystery of the Passion, because of the procession from station to station, which interrupts the continuity of the adoration, does not accord with the legislation of the Church regulating what is proper *coram Sanctissimo.*

CAPPA MAGNA CORAM CARDINALI VEL METROPOLITANO

The *cappa magna* is the ceremonial garment worn by certain prelates when they preside at liturgical functions or when they enter or leave the church before or after pontifical cermonies at which they officiate in sacred vestments. Its use is generally restricted to wearing it in places where the dignitary who puts it on has jurisdiction. Cardinals may wear it throughout the world, though there are certain restrictions governing its use by Their Eminences in the Eternal City. Nuncios Apostolic and Delegates Apostolic wear this regal robe within the territory in which they represent the Holy See. Metropolitans are clad in the *cappa magna* throughout the provinces over which they preside and bishops inside the limits of their dioceses. Titular bishops, *qua tales,* have no right to this garment.

The question sometimes arises as to the proper procedure when several prelates, each of whom may ordinarily wear the *cappa*

magna, assist together at an ecclesiastical function. Such occasions arise fairly frequently when a Cardinal or the Metropolitan attends a ceremony at which the Bishop Ordinary is also present.

When both Metropolitan and Bishop Ordinary assist at Solemn Mass, both wear the *cappa* and both are seated on thrones, a special one being provided for the Metropolitan at the Epistle side of the altar (Martinucci, Lib. VIII, *Addenda;* Stehle, *Manual of Episcopal Ceremonies,* p. 274). If a Cardinal presides at Pontifical Mass by the Bishop of the diocese, Hartinucci (Lib. VI, Appendix, Cap. iv) directs that the Cardinal is to occupy the throne and the Bishop to pontificate at the faldstool, but the latter wears the *cappa* on his entrance into the church and also for his exit after the ceremony.

The decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, dated Dec. 26, 1919, gives various directions governing the simultaneous presence of a Cardinal or the Metropolitan and the Bishop Ordinary at sacred functions. Among these we find that the Bishop in his diocese should wear a folded *cappa, i.e.,* with the train carried over his left arm, when attending a ceremony *coram Cardinali vel Metropolitano,* but that he wears it unfolded and borne by a train-bearer, when he is about to pontificate in the presence of these dignitaries. There is a rather confusing exception in the decree, when it forbids the unfolded *cappa* and the train-bearer for those ceremonies which the Ordinary performs "immediate cum Cardinali aut Metropolitano aut versus eos."

SUBDEACON CARRYING THE PALL AFTER THE ABLUTIONS

Question: We often see the subdeacon at Solemn Mass, after he has attended to the ablutions, carry the pall with him when he exchanges places with the deacon, going over to the Gospel side to make up the chalice. Is there any authority for this practice? It seems to be meaningless.

Answer: No, there is no rubrical direction requiring the subdeacon to carry the pall with him, when, at Solemn Mass, after ministering the ablutions, he passes over to the Gospel side to wipe and vest the chalice. No such instruction will be found in Martinucci or Baldeschi, in the *U. S. Ceremonial* or in Fortescue. The proper procedure is to make the transit *junctis manibus.* As our correspondent remarks, there seems to be little *raison d'être* for the

subdeacon to carry with him what can be easily reached from the other side.

THE OMISSION OF THE SUNDAY *INFRA OCTAVAM EPIPHANIAE* IN 1947

Question: I was puzzled to find this year that, when the Sunday within the Octave of the Epiphany was impeded by the feast of the Holy Family, the Mass of the Sunday was not resumed, as is usual, during the course of the following week. Should not this have been done on Thursday the 11th, the feast of St. Marcellus, which is a semidouble?

Answer: When the Mass of a minor Sunday, such as the one in question, is impeded by a feast of the first or second class, or by a feast of Our Lord, such as that of the Holy Family, the Mass of the feast is celebrated on the Sunday itself, the latter being merely commemorated. Then, during the week following, the Mass of the Sunday is said, provided that during the week a day may be found for it, which is a ferial, a *simplex* feast, a Saturday of the Blessed Virgin, or a day within an octave. If no such day occurs, the Sunday Mass is not reposed that year. We had no such day in 1947 and so there was no reposed Mass of the Sunday within the Octave of the Epiphany. It will be noted that Jan. 13 was not such a day, being the octave day, not a day merely within the octave, of the feast. All the others days of that week were either doubles or, in one case, a semidouble.

DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEAD

Question: Has there been any decree forbidding special devotions to the Sacred Head of our Lord? I seem to recall that there was such a prohibition of multiplying devotions which are all contained in that paid to the Sacred Heart.

Answer: There is a decision of the Holy Office, dated June 18, 1938 (*AAS*, XXX, 226), that no special devotion to the Sacred Head should be introduced. There was no question of a dogmatic character involved since any member of our Lord's sacred Body, especially so noble a member as the Head, could be made the object of a special cult. The decree just cited was the application of a former decree of the Holy Office, that of May 26, 1937 (*AAS*, XXVIII, 304), which legislated against new forms of devotion

which were mere repetitions of existing devotions and some of which were of extravagant and even ridiculous character. A cult of the Sacred Head would be only a slight variation of the already existing devotion to the Holy Face, the cult which is so closely associated with Monsieur Dupont, "the holy man of Tours."

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

DIFFERENT RECKONINGS OF TIME

Question 1: May a priest eat meat at 12.15 A. M., Daylight Saving Time, on Saturday, and yet say Mass later in the day? May he, in the course of the hour between midnight and 1 A. M., Daylight Saving Time, say his Office both for Friday and (Little Hours) for Saturday?

Question 2: May a person shorten an abstinence day to 23 hours by the use of different modes of reckoning time? For example, could he eat meat at 12.50 A. M., Daylight Saving Time, on Friday (arguing that it is still Thursday according to Standard Time), and again eat meat about 23 hours later, at 12.01 A. M., Daylight Saving Time, Saturday (on the plea that Friday is ended according to Daylight Saving Time)?

Answer 1: Various views have been expressed in interpreting Canon 33, §1, which permits one to choose any of the recognized reckonings of time in reference to the private celebration of Mass, the private recitation of the Office, the reception of Holy Communion, and the observance of the law of fast or abstinence. According to one opinion, propounded shortly after the promulgation of the Code, a person must follow one and the same computation for the fulfilment of all these obligations on the same day. Thus, if a priest decided to begin his Little Hours for Saturday immediately after midnight, Daylight Saving Time, of Friday, he would be obliged to observe the eucharistic fast from that same moment (cf. *ami du Clergé,* 1922, p. 637; 1923, p. 200). According to another view, the use of different reckonings is permitted for the observance of different precepts when different acts are involved; but when the same act is involved one may not employ different systems of time. From this it would follow that a priest could recite his Little Hours for Saturday immediately after midnight, Daylight Saving Time, of Friday, and also, until 1 A. M., eat *abstinence*

food without breaking the eucharistic fast; but he could not eat *meat* (cf. Maroto, *Institutiones,* I, n. 258, 2, B). However, according to a third opinion, which seems sufficiently probable to be applied to practice, a person may use different reckonings for the observance of different obligations, even when one and the same act is involved. Thus, a priest may eat meat after Friday has passed, according to Daylight Saving Time, up to 1 A. M., without breaking the eucharistic fast for Saturday. In other words, he is not violating the law of abstinence because he has eaten the meat when Friday was ended according to Daylight Saving Time, and he is not violating the law of the eucharistic fast because he has had nothing to eat or drink since Saturday began according to Standard Time. Similarly, in the course of the hour between midnight and 1 A. M. he may finish his Office for Friday (with the exception noted below), and recite even the Little Hours, Vespers and Compline for Saturday. It would seem, however, that he could not begin his Saturday's Office until he had finished Friday's Office; otherwise he would be following different reckonings for the observance of the same law (cf. Dubé, *The General Principles for the Reckoning of Time in Canon Law* [Catholic University Press, Washington, D. C., 1941], p. 158 ff.).

Answer 2: One may not, by the use of different reckonings, shorten the time for the observance of the Friday abstinence to a period less than 24 hours. In the words of the author just cited: "One cannot begin one's Friday abstinence according to Standard Time, when Daylight Saving Time is being used, and cease observing the law Friday night at midnight, Daylight Saving Time. In this case 24 hours of abstinence would not have lapsed" (Dubé, *op. cit.,* p. 176). According to this same principle, a priest could not, by the use of different reckonings, extend to 25 hours the time for the recitation of those portions of the Office which must be said in the course of a single day, the Little Hours, Vespers, and Compline. Thus, if a priest begins Prime at midnight, Daylight Saving Time, he must finish the Office before the following midnight, Daylight Saving Time.

A PASTOR'S RIGHT TO CONFIRM

Question: Must a pastor ask the permission of the bishop to administer Confirmation, when the conditions called for in the recent

decree are present? And, if the chancery officials take it amiss that a pastor has used this power, may he refrain from sending a record of the Confirmation to the chancery?

Answer: Since the right to confirm, lately granted to pastors in certain circumstances, comes directly from the Holy See, the permission of the bishop is not required for its valid and licit use. However, at times a pastor would be required to consult the bishop before proceeding to confirm a dying person, not for the purpose of asking his permission, but in order to find out if the bishop himself is prepared to administer the sacrament in this particular case. For, it must be remembered that, according to the prescriptions of the recent decree, Confirmation can be validly conferred by a pastor only when a bishop cannot be had—or, at least, cannot be had without grave inconvenience.

The transmission of a record of each Confirmation to the bishop is demanded by the decree, and the reason adduced by the questioner does not seem sufficiently cogent to excuse a pastor from this obligation.

A SURGICAL PROBLEM

Question: A married woman of child-bearing age suffers from uterine prolapse with systocele and rectocele. May a sterilizing operation be performed?

Answer: The sterilizing operation in question would seem to be hysterectomy, the removal of the uterus. If, in the judgment of a competent and conscientious surgeon, this is the only method that will cure the woman of a painful or dangerous condition, the operation may be performed—not, however, at a time when there is even a slight probability that she is pregnant. Moreover, if another method will probably remedy the condition—for example, the use of a rectifying pessary or ventral suspension by the use of uterine ligaments—this method should first be attempted. In any event, if the direct intention of the surgeon is to render the woman sterile, so that she will be spared the inconvenience and danger that might come from a pregnancy, the operation is illicit, at least from the standpoint of the surgeon's subjective attitude. A practical norm for determining the lawfulness of this operation in a particular case is this: If the doctor can honestly testify that the operation would be called for even in the case of a woman who is certainly not going

to become pregnant, then it may lawfully be performed on a woman with the same symptoms who otherwise might become pregnant; but if the probability of future pregnancy is the determining factor in favor of the operation, it is forbidden by the law of God.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the September, 1897, issue of the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, Fr. William Barry, of Dorchester, England, continues his series of articles on the theories of crime and justice defended by Cesare Lombroso, who regarded criminality as a disease which can be transmitted from father to son. In support of his contention that various types of criminals bear distinctive physical characteristics, Lombroso makes such statements as these, quoted by Fr. Barry: "Habitual homicides have in their look something glassy, cold and motionless. . . . Of the forgers and cheats whom I have been allowed to study many had an expression fashioned to singular good nature—something clerical about it—which was indeed necessary to throw their victim off his guard." . . . An article on the Paulists from the pen of an anonymous writer ends with the statement (still applicable to this zealous community): "The Paulist Congregation is steadily moving forward, according to its means, its opportunities and the cooperation of the rest of the Church in the United States, toward the consummation of its apostolic vocation—the conversion of non-Catholic America." . . . A history of St. John's Seminary in Collegeville, Minn., furnishes an inspiring account of the labors of the Benedictines in the United States toward the promotion of clerical training. . . . A reply to a question concerning the fate of children who die without Baptism contains the following statement: "If the soul were to be made conscious of the loss of the beatific vision, it would certainly cause a longing and a regret which would be equivalent to suffering; but that longing would also be equivalent to a baptism of desire. . . . If, as some theologians teach, the expiation of Christ had its direct effect upon all the departed souls, and if the unbaptized children become conscious after death that they possess a capacity for happiness which their necessary condition on earth prevented them from realizing and using, may we not assume that the longing excited by the knowledge will meet the mercy of Christ and bring them eventually to the fruition of His expiation in the beatific vision?" . . . In another reply concerning the costume to be worn by priests when they ride a bicycle it is stated that even then they must wear the Roman collar and the long coat prescribed by the Third Council of Baltimore.

F. J. C.

Analecta

The fourteenth centenary of the death of St. Benedict afforded our Holy Father an opportunity to take special notice of the debt which the world owes to him and his community. This was our Holy Father's purpose in issuing the encyclical, *Fulgens radiatur,* dated March 21, 1947.[1] Approximately twenty thousand words in length, the encyclical recounts briefly the life of St. Benedict and the chief characteristics of his rule. It concludes with the hope that the centenary will stimulate the generosity of all the faithful, especially of those who have been blessed with an abundance of this world's goods, and that as a consequence adequate contributions will be made for the reconstruction of Monte Cassino.

The dedication of ones services to God under a rule of life that prescinds from the common life of religious has been sanctioned by a constitution of our Holy Father entitled *Provida Mater Ecclesia* and dated February 2, 1947.[2] Bishops may found these institutes after consulting the Sacred Congregation of Religious. Their members are required to promise perpetual celibacy, obedience to their superiors, and the use of property within the limitations of the respective constitutions of the institute. The bond of union must be stable, it may however, be temporary if it be understood that it is to be persistently renewed. It must also be mutual and unrestricted, with the result that in accordance with the constitutions the member submits himself unreservedly to the institute and the institute accepts full responsibility for his welfare.

To deal with the problems connected with the founding and the governing of these secular institutes the Sacred Congregation of Religious set up a special commission in its decree of March 25, 1947.[3]

Decretal letters, dated July 7, 1946,[4] recount in brief the history of the cause of Mother Frances Xavier Cabrini, including the ceremonies of canonization which were held on that day.

A *motu proprio,* dated April 7, 1947[5] restores the Rota of the

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XXXIX (1947), 137.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 114.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 131.

[4] *Ibid.,* p. 41.

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 155.

Apostolic Nunciature in Spain. The document itself relates that this tribunal was established by Pope Clement XIV in 1771 and that because of the troubled times it was suppressed in 1932 by Pope Pius XI. Under the terms of the restoration the jurisdiction of the tribunal extends in first instance to only those cases which are referred to it by the Apostolic Nuncio on the petition of one of the Spanish Bishops. It hears appeals from the tribunals of archdiocesan tribunals and even from diocesan tribunals if both parties request it and the archbishop consents. It also hears appeals from the respective boards of Auditors within the Rota itself. The Apostolic Nuncio exercises over the Rota the same authority which a bishop exercises over a diocesan tribunal. The tribunal follows only canonical norms of procedure and the conclusions and sentences of the judges are required to be in Latin unless a justifying reason intervenes. The tribunal is composed of seven judges of whom one is its Dean. The judges must be Spanish citizens, priests, of legitimate birth. Their appointment is to be promulgated at the same time by the Holy See, on the one hand, and by the Spanish Government, on the other.

On January 22, 1947,[6] our Holy Father addressed an allocution to the women members of the Association called "Christian Restoration" assembled in convention at Rome. Taking as his theme the thought of St. Ignatius of Antioch in his letter to the Romans, our Holy Father emphasized the fact that in times when Christianity is the object of the world's hatred, it is her role to speak not persuasive words but rather the language of truth. Nor is ordinary Christian living sufficient. Compliance with the mandates of the Christian life must appear on a grand scale in the lives of Christ's disciples. That this may be accomplished, faith must be strengthened, even though the modern world may call it, as did the world of St. Paul, nothing but foolishness. This attitude must not influence the Christian to surrender any smallest item of his faith to the materialistic demands of modern thought. Coupled with this firm faith must be found a burning zeal, rising from a courageous will, through which the Christian's belief is translated into dynamic forces of action, slow perhaps, but continuous and progressive, making its mark gradually on those who are to be won to Christ. Thus modestly and discreetly, according to the qualities of each apostle, his

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

zeal will make its impact on those within the range of his influence. The allocution closes with the Apostolic Benediction.

On February 19, 1947,[7] our Holy Father addressed a radio message to the school children of the United States. He appealed to them to save their spending money during Lent as a means of assisting their priests and bishops in their effort to head off sickness and hunger and soul-starvation from the homeless, helpless and harried peoples of Europe and Asia.

On January 10, 1947,[8] our Holy Father sent an epistle to His Eminence, Emanuele Cardinal Arteaga y Betancourt, Archbishop of Havana, naming him Apostolic Delegate to the National Eucharistic Congress of Cuba and imparting the Apostolic Benediction to all who should take part in its ceremonies. On February 23, 1947,[9] he addressed a radio message to the Congress. The message pictures the springtime beauty of the Pearl of the Antilles and the corresponding resurgence of the spring of supernatural living in the souls of its people, a resurgence that our Holy Father says he has promoted by decorating its Archbishop with the purple, thus giving it for the first time representation among the Princes of the Church. He glories in their recognition of the Holy Eucharist as the font of the strong and powerful supernatural life which they promise. He commends their action in seeking the definition of the dogma of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin. It is fitting that such a petition should come from an island which was called by Diego Velasquez, the Isle of Our Lady of the Assumption. Their resolve shows that they think with Suarez that this privilege redounds to the glory of God and Christ our Lord, a privilege most fitting to be bestowed on our Lady because of her dignity, and her undefiled innocence, purity and charity. Our Holy Father prays that through her intercession our Eucharistic Lord may free them from the universal plague of materialism. The message closes with the Apostolic Benediction.

Our Holy Father addressed allocutions to the representatives of three nations: on January 12, 1947,[10] to the representative of Argentina; on February 16, 1947,[11] to the representative of China; and on March 17, 1947,[12] to the representative of the Republic of Lebanon. All three close with the Apostolic Benediction. In addressing the representative of Argentina, our Holy Father ex-

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 127.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 87.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 90.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 56.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 88.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 124.

pressed his appreciation for the efforts of that nation in the promotion of a peace based on the fundamental principles enunciated by him, for its generosity to the victims of war on the Continent of Europe and for its recent project of making a survey looking to the settlement of the displaced people of Europe. In speaking to the representative of China, he pointed to the following incidents as indicative of the development of the relations between China and the Holy See: the naming of a native Chinese as a Prince of the Church; the establishment of the episcopal Hierarchy; the canonization of the Chinese martyrs; the appointment of an Apostolic Internuncio; and the appointment by China of a Catholic Minister Plenipotentiary to the Holy See. The allocution comes to a conclusion with the following words: "And as the collonade of the Vatican basilica opens its large arms toward the East, so We now lift Our hands toward the Orient and invoke the protection of the Almighty over the rugged and arduous journey of the Chinese people from twilight to dawn, which We hope will soon shine forth in a secure internal and external peace." In the allocution to the representative of the Republic of Lebanon, our Holy Father observed that the inauguration of direct and permanent official relations between the Republic and the Holy See, rather than an innovation, is a continuation of the intimate mutual interest which goes back to the first days of the origin of the Christian era. He notes that the language of the Minister demonstrates that the people of Lebanon are devoted to the principles enunciated by him as the necessary foundation for a lasting peace and for the collaboration of one nation with another. This is cause for rejoicing for even small nations may play their part in the realization of these objectives, the attainment of which is not to be measured on the basis of the mathematical resources of those who seek them but upon their moral power. His people, the Lebanese, characterized by perfected maturity and by a readiness for adjustment to what is new, strengthened by an essentially religious spirit that unites them in the worship of a personal God, stand as the Cedars of Lebanon as a solid rampart against the assaults of atheism, the destroyer of all civilization.

An Apostolic Constitution, dated January 25, 1946,[13] transfers the deacon's seat [*diaconia*] of the Church of St. Hadrian to the

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 54.

Church of St. Paul in Arenula. The former Church, once the seat of the Roman Senate, had been taken some years previously by the civil government with the consent of ecclesiastical authority for the purpose of restoring it to its ancient state as a public monument.

Divisions of dioceses, vicariates, and prefectures and the establishment of new ecclesiastical jurisdictional units are effected by several Apostolic Constitutions. A Constitution dated July 4, 1946,[14] separates the Marianna Islands from the Vicariate of the Mariannas, the Carolina and the Marshall Islands, and attaches them to the Vicariate of Guam. On the same day,[15] a decree of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith placed these Islands under the Apostolic Delegate to the United States, instead of the Apostolic Delegate to Japan, under whose charge they had formerly been governed.

A new Diocese, Kamloops, has been established out of territory taken from the Archdiocese of Vancouver, to which the new Diocese will be subject as a suffragan See.[16] In Brazil, territory has been taken from the Dioceses of Nictheroy and of Barra do Pirahy for the establishment of the new Diocese of Petropolis, which is made a suffragan of the Archdiocese of San Sebastiano de Rio de Janeiro.[17] In British East Africa, two new Vicariates have been created to replace the Vicariate of Tanganyika: the Vicariates of Kigoma et Karema.[18] In the same region, the new Vicariate of Musoma et Maswa has been established in territory taken from the Vicariate of Mwanza.[19] The name of the Vicariate of Papua has been changed to that of Port Moresby and a portion of its territory has been taken to create the new Prefecture of Samaraia.[20] In Egypt the Patriarchal Vicariate of the Maronites has been made a Diocese, named the Diocese of Cahiran.[21] In Peru a new Diocese of Ica has been established in territory taken from the Diocese of Ayacucho and the Archdiocese of Lima; it has been made a suffragan See of the latter.[22] In India, the Prefecture of Gorakphur has been established in territory taken from the Diocese of Allahabad, the latter now entrusted to the native clergy with the resignation of its Bishop, who was a Capuchin; the Prefecture remains subject to the care of

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 164.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 95.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 73.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 77.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 80.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 76.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 82.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 84.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 167.

the Capuchins.[23] A decree of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith has changed the name of the Prefecture of Broken Hill in Rhodesia to the Prefecture of Lusaka, thus designating the town in which it has its seat.[24] Another decree of the same Sacred Congregation has changed the name of the Apostolic Delegation in Africa to DELEGATIO APOSTOLICA AFRICAE ORIENTALIS ET OCCIDENTALIS BRITTANICAE.[25]

The appointments of the following members of the hierarchy are authentically reported: January 11, 1947, Most Rev. J. Carroll McCormick, D.D., Titular Bishop of Ruspe and Auxiliary of the Cardinal Archbishop of Philadelphia;[26] February 15, 1947, Most Rev. Mark Carroll, D.D., Bishop of Wichita;[27] under the same date, Most Rev. Allen Babcock, D.D., Titular Bishop of Irenopolis and Auxiliary of the Cardinal Archbishop of Detroit.[28] Besides these appointments, the following were also announced in the secret consistory held on March 10, 1947; Most Rev. Joseph E. Ritter, D.D., Archbishop of St. Louis;[29] Most Rev. Paul Schulte, D.D., Archbishop of Indianapolis;[30] Most Rev. J. Francis A. McIntyre, D.D., Titular Archbishop of Paltus to be Coadjutor of the Cardinal Archbishop of New York;[31] Most Rev. Francis J. L. Beckman, D.D., Titular Archbishop of Phulli;[32] Most Rev. Leo F. Dworshak, D.D., Titular Bishop of Tium and Auxiliary of the Bishop of Rapid City;[33] Most Rev. Daniel J. Feeney, D.D., Titular Bishop of Sita and Auxiliary of the Bishop of Portland;[34] Most Rev. Daniel Ivancho, D.D., Titular Bishop of Europus and Coadjutor with the right of succession of Most Rev. Basil Takach, D.D., Apostolic Exarch in the United States for the Ruthenians of the Byzantine Rite from Podocarpatia;[35] Most Rev. Timothy Manning, D.D., Titular Bishop of Lesvi and Auxiliary of the Archbishop of Los Angeles;[36] Most Rev. Edward A. Fitzgerald, D.D., Titular Bishop of Cantanus and Auxiliary of the Archbishop of Dubuque;[37] Most Rev. George J. Donnelly, D.D., Bishop of Leavenworth;[38] Most

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 165.
[24] *Ibid.*, p. 66.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 96.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 64.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 65.
[28] *Loc. cit.*
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 106.
[30] *Loc. cit.*
[31] *Loc. cit.*
[32] *Ibid.*, p. 107.
[33] *Loc. cit.*
[34] *Loc. cit.*
[35] *Ibid.*, p. 108.
[36] *Loc. cit.*
[37] *Ibid.*, p. 109.
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 110.

Rev. Aloysius J. Willinger, S.SS.R., D.D., Titular Bishop of Bida and Coadjutor with the right of succession of the Bishop of Monterey-Fresno;[39] Most Rev. Albert L. Fletcher, D.D., Bishop of Little Rock.[40]

On January 7, 1947,[41] our Holy Father sent a letter to the Bishop of Cortona to commemorate the seventh centenary of the birth of St. Margaret of Cortona and of the death of Blessed Guido. In it he joins the citizens of that city in their celebration of these events, especially in their acts of thanksgiving for the sparing of their city in the midst of the ravages of war, while he holds before them the example of those whom they commemorate. The letter closes with the Apostolic Benediction.

By a decree of March 20, 1947,[42] the Holy Office, referring to its decree of August 31, 1887, replied negatively to the question whether the banners of political parties may be blessed.

By a decree of January 25, 1947,[43] the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities established the Pontifical University of St. Paul in Brazil.

Three decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites are authentically reported: July 12, 1946,[44] introducing the cause of the Servant of God, Emanuele Domingo y Sol, Founder of the Congregation of Diocesan Priest Laborers; December 8, 1946,[45] approving the two miracles required for the canonization of Blessed Joseph Cafasso, secular priest, director of the Ecclesiastical College of Turin; and February 16, 1947,[46] also affecting the latter, authorizing further steps toward his formal canonization.

RECENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS ANNOUNCED IN THE *ACTA APOSTOLICAE SEDIS*

Protonotary Apostolic, ad instar participantium:

December 15, 1945: Rt. Rev. Edward A. Lefebvre, of the Diocese of Saginaw.

Domestic Prelates of His Holiness:

June 2, 1946: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Joseph A. Casey, Patrick J. Hayes, John J. Code, Peter F. Shewbridge, Daniel F. Cunningham, Malachy P. Foley, John A. Neumann, Frederick E. Hillenbrand, Reynold Hillenbrand, James J. Strzycki, John J. Klozlowski, John F. Zelezinski, Victor

[39] *Loc. cit.*
[40] *Loc. cit.*
[41] *Ibid.*, p. 170.
[42] *Ibid.*, p. 130.
[43] *Ibid.*, p. 134.
[44] *Ibid.*, p. 97.
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 99.
[46] *Ibid.*, p. 132.

Blahunka, Innocent Kestl, William A. O'Connor, Edward M. Burke, Joseph B. Lux, Thomas B. O'Brien, Cyril A. Poissant, Henry W. McGuire, Martin J. Nealis, John J. O'Hearn, William P. Long, George A. Parker, Walter L. Fasnacht, George Eisenbacker, John M. Lange, Stanislaus P. Cholewinski, Francis I. Rusch, Francis O. McCarthy, Martin D. McNamara and Patrick J. McGuire, of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

July 14, 1946: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Francis J. O'Connor, Joseph J. Rapien, Alfred G. Thomson, Curtis J. Hornsey, George J. Hildner, John P. Cody [now Auxiliary of the Archbishop], Joseph A. Vogelweid, Florence Lupo, Joseph F. Lubeley, Edward A. Rogers, and William A. Hamtil, of the Archdiocese of St. Louis.

Plaque of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:

June 10, 1946: Commander Joseph F. Lamb, of the Archdiocese of New York.

Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:

June 10, 1946: Francis J. Heazel, of the Diocese of Raleigh.

Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:

November 28, 1945: John E. Toomey, of the Diocese of Mobile.

Grand Cross of the Order of St. Sylvester, Pope:

August 5, 1946: George W. Strake, of the Diocese of Galveston.

Commander of the Order of St. Sylvester, Pope:

July 14, 1946: Lt. Col. Luigi Savini (U.S.A.).

The Reign of Our Lady in America

So, then, Mary has gained vast possessions in this country. One day, let us hope, she will conquer it all, and annex it all, loyal and devoted, to the kingdom of her Son. There are peculiarities in her conquests and in her sacred warfare without parallel in the victories of the sword. The weapons of her hosts are gentleness, and mercy, and weariless affection; self-sacrifice and refusal of reward on earth; and better still, whenever a soldier falls, fighting bravely in the front rank for her honor, his death only strengthens her armies and helps to insure the success of her cause. From the soil which was enriched by the blood of the martyrs, spring the flowers that deck her altars in the month of May.

Fr. Xavier Donald Macleod, in *Devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary in North America* (New York, 1866), p. 4.

Book Reviews

FUNDAMENTAL RUBRICS. PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS. By Rev. John C. O'Leary, Ph.D. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1946. Pp. 121. $1.75.

This manual has our enthusiastic vote as a concise and orderly guide to the basic principles which underly the rubrics and the liturgical legislation of the Church. A study of its pages will be found very illuminating and for all but the very few it will be found a salutary examination of the ceremonial conscience with the resultant discovery of faults of which many are guilty.

The contents are first a series of pertinent directions concerning the more frequent liturgical gestures, such as the sign of the cross, the position of the hands, genuflections and bows. Then follow notes of the Solemn Mass with separate rules for celebrant, deacon, and subdeacon. The thirty-four common errors committed in the celebration of Low Mass are an up-to-date presentation of Martinucci's famous ninety-four paragraphs. Particularly useful are the notes concerning the proper procedure for exposition and Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament and for the conduct of funeral services. "No ceremony of the Church," the author aptly remarks, "suffers so much from incorrect or careless performance as the last ministrations over the remains of her departed children." With the multiplication of domestic prelates in this country, the chapter on the correct protocol for *Monsignori* will be read with especial interest.

The text is well supported by authority and liturgical sources are quoted. In the absence of these, the author cites the Roman practice, with which he is evidently familiar, and, in some instances, he makes practical suggestions of his own. All in all, the little volume merits a place in the working library of every priest who aims to carry out the ceremonies, in which he is officiant or minister, with accuracy and decorum.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

LE SAINT ESPRIT EN NOUS D'APRES LES PERES GRECS. By Paul Galtier, S.J. Rome: Gregorian University, 1946. Pp. 290.

This scholarly book is not a positive study, as the title seems to imply, but rather a verification of an opinion expressed by Petau, better known as Petavius. This well-known theologian of the seventeenth century advanced the opinion that, according to the Greek Fathers, formal sanc-

tification in the soul of the just is the result of divine inhabitation, with a particular emphasis on the Holy Ghost. So far there is nothing new in this opinion, but when he explains it, it becomes controversial, for he attributes to the Greek Fathers the idea of a personal union of the Holy Spirit with the soul of the just, a union which, because personal, could not be shared, in the same relation, by the Person of the Father and of the Son: "Proprie ergo et singulari modo Spiritus Sanctus cum iis quos sanctos facit coniungitur. Proinde secundum hypostasim, non secundum essentiam dumtaxat, hoc illi convenit, nam quidquid proprium est personae cuiuspiam hoc rationem hypostasis, non essentiae, sequitur" (Petavius, *De Trinitate,* VIII, vi, 6). Sanctifying grace *(gratia creata)* is a participation of divine nature: "divinae consortes naturae" *(II Pet.* 1:4). Divine nature is one, and whoever partakes of it must necessarily be united to the three Divine Persons who share the same nature, hence the doctrine of the indwelling of the Blessed Trniity in the soul of the just. Petau maintained that the language of the Greek Fathers in general, and that of Cyril of Alexandria in particular, could not be interpreted of a mere union of divine essence, but of a special union in the person of the Holy Ghost, as distinct from the other persons. Such an interpretation would seem to conflict with established Trinitarian notions. What is not relative in divine operations pertains to nature and not to a distinct person in the divinity, except by appropriation. Fr. Galtier is the first to put to a test the assertion made by Petavius. In this book he has analyzed the doctrine of the Greek Fathers on the subject of sanctification by the Holy Ghost and the two other Persons of the Trinity. By a comprehensive examination of texts and by sound criticism, he has come to the conclusion that the opinion expressed by Petavius is unfounded. The stressing of the *agiastiké dynamis* with reference to the Holy Ghost on the part of the Greek Fathers, had only one purpose, according to Fr. Galtier, that of proving the divinity of His Person against heretics: "Le langage des Pères grecs est constamment relatif: ilso se réfère à une erreur à réfuter. . . . Ainsi sont ils amenés à présenter le Saint esprit comme étant la sainteté même, comme le sanctificateur par excellence" (p. 8). Their works on the Holy Ghost are generally of a polemic nature. They insist on His power of sanctification in order to prove His divine nature and His equality with the Father and the Son. However, the same Fathers attribute the same power to the other two persons of the Trinity. The terms *agiazein* and *agiasmos* are a property of the divine nature and, therefore, common to all divine persons (p. 186). They speak of the effect of divine adoption by the Father and the Son in the Holy Spirit (pp. 119, 141).

Beginning with the role of the Holy Ghost in the New Testament,

the author examines in chronological order the testimonies of the Greek Fathers, with a special chapter on Cyril of Alexandria. In his conclusion he states that the property of sanctification belongs to the divine essence and is common to the three divine Persons. The opinion advanced by Petavius has no real foundation in the Greek Fathers. Fr. Galtier's study is a good addition to Trinitarian works.

PASCAL P. PARENTE

INTRODUCTORY SOCIOLOGY. By Raymond W. Murray, C.S.C. Second edition. New York: F. S. Crofts and Company. Pp. xii + 990. $6.00.

In 1935 Fr. Murray published a textbook of sociology which enjoyed a wide popularity. The present volume, which is modestly put forward as a second edition, is actually a new book, running to more than twice the length of the previous one. This increased length gives ample room for a very full treatment of the subject. The volume has two major divisions, of which the first deals with the study of sociology, man's biological and cultural heritage, and the social nature of man, while the second covers collective behavior, the community, social institutions, and social maladjustments.

There is a rather general tendency among contemporary American writers to define sociology as an exclusively empirical science, completely divorced from ethics, metaphysics, theology, and all other supra-empirical disciplines. Fr. Murray points out that this ideal cannot very well be followed in practice. "In spite of its boasting about the use of strict empirical methods, modern behavioristic sociology, if it is to remain sociology, cannot get away from philosophy" (p. 30). Fr. Murray's own viewpoint is expressed in the following words: "Rather than *attempt* to limit himself to the use of the methods of natural science, as so many modern sociologists claim to do, the Catholic sociologist believes that for a complete sociology scientific methods must be integrated with the truths of philosophy and religion or revelation" (p. 36).

Fr. Murray follows his methodological principles consistently. He gives empirical facts but he interprets them constantly in the light of Catholic social principles. Chapter XXIII ("Economic Institutions") can serve as an example of his method. It begins with a brief history of economic systems from primitive times to the full development of capitalism in the early twentieth century. Then follows a discussion of the New Deal, toward which Fr. Murray's attitude is essentially that of Msgr. John A. Ryan, and a discussion of current problems. Finally the co-operative movement and the corporative order are treated. Thus the reader not

only gains insight into the present socio-economic situation and its background, but also learns principles applying to possible future policies.

Fr. Murray constantly keeps in mind the needs of the beginning student. His treatment, therefore, is held on a rather elementary level. In the appendices particularly, there are some references to the more technical literature; but for the most part he cites the more popular periodicals. This would seem to be a good approach for the elementary student; it ties up sociology with the reading matter which is more familiar to him. For students who intend to go on to advanced work in sociology the teacher would do well to supplement Fr. Murray's textbook by occasional assigned readings of a more technical character. Beside its use in the classroom, this volume will be excellent for study clubs, Catholic Action groups, and the general Catholic reading public. The priest will find it a useful book to recommend to those who inquire about the social doctrine of the Church and its application to modern conditions.

PAUL HANLEY FURFEY

OUR LADY OF LIGHT. Translated and abridged from the French of Chanoine C. Barthas and Pére G. Da Fonseca, S.J. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co. Pp. x + 225. $2.50.

This book gives a simple matter-of-fact account of the apparitions of the Blessed Virgin Mary to three peasant children, two girls and a boy ranging in age from seven to ten, at Fatima in Portugal during the year 1917. Before giving the narrative of the apparitions the author sketches very briefly the devotion of Portugal to our Lady and describes Fatima. Then follow narratives of the six successive apparitions, which occured on the thirteenth of the month from May to October inclusive, 1917. The second part of the book describes the development of the devotion to our Lady of Fatima. The third part tells the story of the three peasant children, recipients of the apparitions. A fourth part sets down a cross-section of the many miracles which have been worked at Fatima or elsewhere through the intercession of our Lady of Fatima. These prodigies—whether they have been officially recognized as miracles by proper ecclesiastical authority, we are not told—are truly remarkable, and are classed under the headings of "Atmospheric," "Miraculous Cures," "Moral Miracles" (conversions), and finally the "Greatest Miracle," namely the transformation of Portugal, politically and religiously, from one of the worst governed and religiously weak nations into one whose form of government and executive officials are perhaps the best in the world today, and where religious fervor and faith have reached an enviably high peak. The last part of the book

presents "Documentary Evidence." Included in this is the series of questions put by ecclesiastical authority to the three peasant children who had the apparitions, and their answers; the joint pastoral of the Hierarchy of Portugal, the Message of Pope Pius XII to Portugal, and finally the prayers which the little seers of Fatima were taught by our Lady itself.

Although this largely factual account is written with no attempt at literary artistry, this reviewer found the narrative to be of compelling interest, simply because of the extraordinary and truly marvelous and deeply moving character of the facts narrated, and the simple beauty and evident holiness of the lives of the three little children who were favored by our Blessed Lady with the apparitions and entrusted with a most important message for the world. No one can read this book, provided he has faith in the supernatural, without being strengthened in faith and moved to a more prayerful and mortified life. The message of Fatima can be summed up in three points: penance, prayer (especially the recitation of the Rosary) and devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. We urgently need to be reminded of these basic principles of the Christian life today.

JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M.

THE PROGRESS OF THE JESUITS. By James Brodrick, S.J. New York: Longmans Green and Co., 1947. Pp. vi + 337. $3.50.

As the author frankly observes in his preface, this is in some respects a one-sided book: it confines itself almost entirely to the history of the Jesuits from the death of St. Ignatius (1556) to the election of his fourth successor, Claude Aquaviva (1581). As a consequence, the activities of the secular priesthood and of other religious orders during this period receive but passing consideration. This, as Fr. Brodrick notes with regret, is due to the limitation of his theme and not to any lack of appreciation of their merits. In fact, he warns his readers not to conceive a distorted idea of the exploits of the Jesuits because he focuses their attention chiefly upon his brethren. At the same time, to allay any suspicion that he has composed a partisan eulogy, he informs us that he intends to tell the whole truth, without minimizing praise or blame. In this connection, he quotes appropriately the words of Boswell: "There is a tragic beauty to the *whole* truth that no degree of decorative evasion can ever supplant or conceal."

The author's previous works in the historical field make it antecedently probable that he has accomplished his purpose. He has shown himself to be a painstaking and competent researcher, with keen and sensitive insight, sound judgment, and admirable narrative and de-

scriptive gifts. These qualities are also apparent in the present book. It is scientific, without being pedantic and boring. Lights and shadows are distributed in due proportion; persons and events are weighed, without being divested of the imaginative and emotional glow which is rightfully theirs. The narrative is clear yet vivid and illuminated with occasional flashes of wit and humor. Primary sources have been utilized honestly and judiciously.

The author has chosen an epoch of general interest to the Catholic Church and portrayed it with reliability, dignity, and literary artistry. Some of the topics discussed are controversial. Hence an accurate appraisal of them, such as we find here, must afford satisfaction to all students of Church history.

Fr. Brodrick guides us through the successive phases of development by concentrating upon the leading agents of this development. We learn how the infant Society escaped shipwreck, during the critical years immediately following the death of St. Ignatius, despite the turmoil of war, the spirit of nationalism, the intransigence of Bobadilla, and the prejudices of a hot-tempered Pontiff. The conflicts with the Gallican Parliament of Paris and the abject poverty of the pioneer Jesuits did not halt the establishment of the College of Clermont, which subsequently became the nursing mother of such diverse geniuses as St. Francis de Sales, Cardinal de Berulle, Descartes, Corneille, Moliere, and Voltaire. Much of the renown of the nascent order was due to James Laynez, its second general, a brilliant theologian, who preferred the humblest tasks to any display of his superior talents. The important part which Jerome Nadal played in imbuing the growing Society with the genuine spirit of its founder will prove surprising to many. The succinct account of the almost incredible labors and journeys of St. Peter Canisius in behalf of the counter-Reformation is especially valuable. We are also afforded an interesting glimpse of the appalling conditions prevailing in Scotland at the time of the ill-fated Mary, Queen of Scots. The exertions of the Fathers in Brazil and the martyrdom of Bl. Ignatius Azevedo and his forty companions at the hands of Calvinist pirates show that the spirit of heroism was not lacking in the sons of Loyola. This also shines forth in the story of the first missionaries to Abyssinia; it forms a particularly fascinating section of the book. There are also brief sketches of such outstanding personalities of the order as St. Francis Borgia, Maldonatus, St. Robert Bellarmine, Suarez, Baltasar Alvarez, and Alphonsus Rodriguez, the author of the *Practice of Christian and Religious Perfection*. In short, Fr. Brodrick has rendered a conspicuous service not only to the Society of Jesus but also the Church by his well-documented, impartial, and interesting presentation of an important period in the history of his

order. We hope that he will continue the series of which this forms the second volume.

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

THE NEW LECTIONARY. By Rev. Clement H. Crock. New York: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., 1947. Pp. x + 425. $5.00.

To read effectively requires more than mere elocutionary skill. It calls for interpretation of the highest order. To help toward that accomplishment, to facilitate a more intelligent understanding of the sacred words of the Epistles and Gospels, the New Lectionary has been presented to the American clergy. It contains the Epistles and Gospels for every Sunday and Holyday under a new format which can be read with greater ease, proper inflection, and better appreciation. The text of the New Testament printed here is that of the revision prepared by the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. It is interesting to note that two schemas are offered for each Sunday indicating the themes of the day's Liturgy. This should serve as helpful material for the priest in preparing next Sunday's sermon. The Author views the New Lectionary as a sort of Companion to the Sunday Missal and hopes its use may in some way help our people who are becoming more and more interested in the Liturgy of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

The author, Fr. Crock, and the arranger, Fr. Scharrer, C.PP.S., have turned out an attractive work. The word grouping into logical units and the large black print is striking, and in the opinion of this reviewer an improvement over the regular method of printed representation.

JOSEPH V. SULLIVAN

SACRIFICARE. CEREMONIES OF LOW MASS. By Le Vavasseur, Haegy, and Stercky, of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost. Translated by a member of the same Congregation. New York: Catholic Book Publishing Co., 1946. Pp. 126. $2.00.

This little book is fundamentally a translation of the Le Vavasseur-Haegy *Manuel de liturgie et serémonial selon le rite romain.* It is a clear and well-arranged conspectus of the ceremonies of Low Mass after the pattern of Zualdi's *Caeremoniale missae privatae,* which is perhaps better known in this country in its English version by O'Callaghan. After a summary of the general rules concerning the position of the body and of the hands, the bows and genuflections, there is a detailed description of the ceremonies of Low Mass, the text of the rubrics of the Missal *(Ritus servandus in celebratione missae)* being given in translation, to which is added the author's commentary, supported by references to the decrees of the Sacred Congregation and to recognized authorities.

Bination, the distribution of Holy Communion, purification of the ciborium and lunula, and the variations to be observed in Masses *coram Sanctissimo* and in the presence of prelates form the subjects of special chapters. Useful *addenda* are the sections which summarize the actions of the celebrant, point out the faults most often committed in the celebration of Mass, and describe the procedure to be followed when defects or accidents occur.

This manual may be confidently recommended as a text-book for seminarians learning the ceremonies of Mass and for priests, both for answers to difficulties which may arise and for review, which often leads to the discovery of incorrect practices, long unsuspected.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

GOD'S LOVE FOR HIS MISSIONERS

God gives special care and protection to those who labor for the propagation of the faith. God works in such a way that those who are most completely deprived of human help are brought most rapidly into His faith and placed under His special protection, for it is written of Him "To thee is the poor man left: thou wilt be a helper to the orphan." For this very reason He will not fail to watch over those who have become pilgrims upon this earth in order to save unbelievers. These men and women are wayfarers upon the earth; they are poor pilgrims, carrying neither purse nor scrip. They are orphans and destitute, since they have not only left their fathers and mothers, but have despised all created things, friends, the favors of men, and earthly goods, because of their love for souls. Hence what David says in the Psalm applies especially to them: "He that dwelleth in the aid of the most High, shall abide under the protection of the God of Heaven." Consequently they enjoy those other privileges mentioned in that same Psalm. The divine providence will overshadow them with His shoulders, and He shall compass them with His shield. They shall not be afraid of the terror of the night, that is, of the hidden snares of the enemy, nor of the arrow that flies by day, that is, of the manifest tentatives of the enemies against them. And finally it follows that they share most perfectly in that promise of Christ: "Behold I am with you unto the consummation of the world," because Our Lord made that promise, not only to the Apostles, but also to their successors. And, since the Savior is going to be with them, they will have all that they could desire.

Thomas a Jesu, in *De procuranda salute omnium gentium,* first published in 1613, and reprinted at Rome, from the International College of St. Teresa, 1940. The passage translated is found on pp. 51 f. of the Roman edition.